

Mr. TOWER. I get a little tired of hearing this issue always referred to as a civil rights issue. It is not a civil rights issue, regardless of what may be one's feelings about rule XXII and regardless of what may be one's feelings about civil rights legislation. The issue is whether the Senate is a continuing body.

I can see the opening of a virtual Pandora's box of possibilities if we should decide that the Senate is not a continuing body and could readopt its rules at the beginning of each session.

I belong to the minority party, and I tremble to think of what might happen to us Republicans at the beginning, not necessarily of the next Congress, but of this Congress. Could not then the majority write its own rules and completely wipe out any safeguards the minority party may have?

I do not suggest that my good friends on the Democratic side of the aisle are going to do this. Certainly I know that my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], with his sense of fairplay and justice, would be no party to writing rules which would enable the Senate to run roughshod over the minority party, but it might be noted that sometimes political pressures are very great and the pressures of the moment might make it appear expedient to suffocate the voice of the minority party.

It is also altogether possible—though in this past election it did not seem too probable—that the Republicans will someday become a majority in the Senate, and this action could work in the worst interests of the Democratic Party.

I think this is a matter that certainly should be given the most careful attention and consideration by those who would hold that this body is not continuous and must readopt its rules at the beginning of each session.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina for a question.

Mr. ERVIN. Would not the Senator agree with me in the observation that in establishing a rule of law or a rule of procedure, perhaps the wisest test as to its wisdom is, "What can bad men do with this rule?" rather than "What can be done with it by good men?"

Mr. TOWER. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina for raising that very important question. I think that is a good maxim to apply. I think sometimes it is necessary to balance potential evil against potential good and to realize that in attempting to do something good we can open the door for great evil. There are times when the remedy is worse than the illness. One can take too much medicine and kill himself with it.

I think this is something upon which every Member of the Senate should pause to reflect. What are the possibilities for evil which could be wrought by turning over a precedent which is as old as the organization of the Government of the United States under the Constitution? I hope we shall think on it carefully, and come up with the correct answer.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced by unanimous consent, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 295. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the laws prohibiting espionage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, during the speech delivered by Mr. EASTLAND.)

By Mr. PELL:

S.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multi-State authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PELL relating to the above joint resolution, which appear under separate headings.)

RECESS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17 (legislative day of January 15), 1963:

FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSION

Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Jack Beaty, of New Mexico, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board, vice Russell A. Stuart, resigned.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Frank Kowalski, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term expiring April 9, 1967, vice Thomas James Donegan, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 3: 17: That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith.

Almighty God, whom we reverently worship in these moments of prayer, may there be mediated unto us and channeled through us a larger measure of the cardinal virtues of faith, hope, and love.

We penitently acknowledge that there is often within our souls a strange mingling of faith and fear, of affirmation and denial, of courage and cowardice.

Grant that we may seek to have a greater part in lifting the anxieties of groping humanity into anthems of joy

and praise and may the terrors, which haunt the mind of man, be supplanted by the shouts of triumph and peace.

May all who hold positions of leadership and trust daily find their hearts enlarged and enriched with the guiding and strengthening ministry of Thy Holy Spirit.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 14, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 20, United States Code, sections 42 and 43, has reappointed Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. ANDERSON members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on the part of the Senate.

NATHANIEL A. DENMAN AND LUCILLE G. DENMAN AGAINST JOHN W. McCORMACK ET AL.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

The Chair, in his representative capacity, and the following Members in their representative capacity: Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., F. BRADFORD MORSE, WILLIAM H. BATES, TORBERT H. MACDONALD, HASTINGS KEITH, THOMAS P. O'NEILL, and JAMES A. BURKE, and the Clerk of the House in his official capacity, have been summoned to appear before the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts in the case of Nathaniel A. Denman and others against JOHN W. McCORMACK and others. Under the precedents of the House, the Chair, the Members heretofore mentioned, and the Clerk are unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. The Chair, on behalf of himself, the Members heretofore referred to, and the Clerk, submits the matter for the consideration of this body.

The Clerk will read the summons.

The Clerk read as follows:

[U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts—Civil action file No. 62-434-J]

NATHANIEL A. DENMAN and LUCILLE G. DENMAN, PLAINTIFFS, v. JOHN W. McCORMACK, JOSEPH WILLIAM MARTIN, JR., F. BRADFORD MORSE, WILLIAM H. BATES, THOMAS J. LANE, TORBERT H. MACDONALD, HASTINGS KEITH, LAURENCE CURTIS, THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JAMES A. BURKE, LEVERETT SALZONSTALL, EDWARD M. KENNEDY, and RALPH R. ROBERTS, DEFENDANTS

SUMMONS

To the Above-Named Defendants:

You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon Nathaniel A. Denman, whose address is Box 689, Falmouth, Cape Cod, Mass., an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 60 days

after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

JOHN A. CANAVAN,
Clerk of the Court.
JOHN F. DAVIS,
Deputy Clerk.

Date: January 2, 1963.
A true copy.
Attest:

WILLIAM H. BALDWIN,
Deputy U.S. Marshal.

NOTE.—This summons is issued pursuant to rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read a copy of the letter that the Chair has sent to the Attorney General of the United States in connection with the case heretofore mentioned.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 17, 1963.

The Honorable the ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Department of Justice.

SIR: I did on last evening, January 16, accept service in the case of *Denman v. McCormack et al.*, from Deputy U.S. Marshal Morina. I have asked the deputy marshal to present this summons and letter to you so that you may proceed in accordance with the law.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 107) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means:

Ross Bass, of Tennessee; W. Pat Jennings, of Virginia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 108) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the Eighty-eighth Congress the Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of 35 members;

The Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of 50 members;

The Committee on Armed Services shall be composed of 37 members;

The Committee on Banking and Currency shall be composed of 31 members;

The Committee on the District of Columbia shall be composed of 25 members;

The Committee on Education and Labor shall be composed of 31 members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of 33 members;

The Committee on Government Operations shall be composed of 31 members;

The Committee on House Administration shall be composed of 25 members;

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be composed of 33 members;

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 33 members;

The Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of 35 members;

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be composed of 31 members;

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall be composed of 25 members;

The Committee on Public Works shall be composed of 34 members; and

The Committee on Science and Astronautics shall be composed of 31 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 109) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Harold D. Cooley, of North Carolina, chairman; W. R. Poage, of Texas; George M. Grant, of Alabama; E. C. Gathings, of Arkansas; John L. McMillan, of South Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, of Mississippi; Watkins M. Abbitt, of Virginia; Paul C. Jones, of Missouri; Harlan Hagen, of California; Lester R. Johnson, of Wisconsin; D. R. (Billy) Matthews, of Florida; Frank A. Stubblefield, of Kentucky; Ralph R. Harding, of Idaho; G. Elliott Hagan, of Georgia; Graham Purcell, of Texas; James H. Morrison, of Louisiana; Benjamin S. Rosenthal, of New York; Robert B. Duncan, of Oregon; Alec G. Olson, of Minnesota; Robert L. Leggett, of California; Spark M. Matsunaga, of Hawaii.

Committee on Appropriations: Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, chairman; George H. Mahon, of Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, of California; Albert Thomas, of Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, of Ohio; Jamie L. Whitten, of Mississippi; George W. Andrews, of Alabama; John J. Rooney, of New York; J. Vaughan Gary, of Virginia; John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island; Robert L. F. Sikes, of Florida; Otto E. Passman, of Louisiana; Joe L. Evin, of Tennessee; John F. Shelley, of California; Edward P. Boland, of Massachusetts; William H. Natcher, of Kentucky; Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania; Winfield K. Denton, of Indiana; Tom Steed, of Oklahoma; Joseph M. Montoya, of New Mexico; George E. Shipley, of Illinois; John M. Slack, Jr., of West Virginia; John Lesinski, of Michigan; John J. Flynt, Jr., of Georgia; Neal Smith, of Iowa; Robert N. Giaimo, of Connecticut; Julia Butler Hansen, of Washington; Edward R. Finnegan, of Illinois; Charles S. Joelson, of New Jersey; Joseph P. Addabbo, of New York.

Committee on Armed Services: Carl Vinson, of Georgia, chairman; L. Mendel Rivers, of South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, of Louisiana; Arthur Winstead, of Mississippi; Melvin Price, of Illinois; O. C. Fisher, of Texas; Porter Hardy, Jr., of Virginia; Clyde Doyle, of California; Charles E. Bennett, of Florida; Richard E. Lankford, of Maryland; George Huddleston, Jr., of Alabama; James A. Byrne, of Pennsylvania; Samuel S. Stratton, of New York; Jeffery Cohelan, of California; Victor Wickersham, of Oklahoma; Otis G. Pike, of New York; Joe M. Kilgore, of Texas; Richard (Dick) Ichord, of Missouri; Lucien N. Nedzi, of Michigan; Clarence D. Long, of Maryland.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Wright Patman, of Texas, chairman; Albert Rains, of Alabama; Abraham J. Multer, of New York; William A. Barrett, of Pennsylvania; Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan, of Missouri; Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin;

Thomas L. Ashley, of Ohio; Charles A. Vanik, of Ohio; William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania; Robert G. Stephens, Jr., of Georgia; Fernand J. St. Germain, of Rhode Island; Henry B. Gonzalez, of Texas; Claude Pepper, of Florida; Joseph G. Minish, of New Jersey; Charles L. Weltner, of Georgia; Richard T. Hanna, of California; Bernard F. Grabowski, of Connecticut; Charles H. Wilson, of California.

Committee on the District of Columbia: John L. McMillan, of South Carolina, chairman; Thomas G. Abernethy, of Mississippi; Howard W. Smith, of Virginia; William L. Dawson, of Illinois; John Bell Williams, of Mississippi; Abraham J. Multer, of New York; John Dowdy, of Texas; George Huddleston, Jr., of Alabama; Basil L. Whitener, of North Carolina; Jeffery Cohelan, of California; Fernand J. St. Germain, of Rhode Island; James W. Trimble, of Arkansas; B. F. Sisk, of California; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., of Michigan; G. Elliott Hagan, of Georgia.

Committee on Education and Labor: Adam C. Powell, of New York, chairman; Carl D. Perkins, of Kentucky; Phil M. Landrum, of Georgia; Edith Green, of Oregon; James Roosevelt, of California; Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey; Elmer J. Holland, of Pennsylvania; John H. Dent, of Pennsylvania; Roman C. Pucinski, of Illinois; Dominick V. Daniels, of New Jersey; John Brademas, of Indiana; James G. O'Hara, of Michigan; Ralph J. Scott, of North Carolina; Hugh L. Carey, of New York; Augustus F. Hawkins, of California; Carlton R. Sickles, of Maryland; Sam M. Gibbons, of Florida; Thomas P. Gill, of Hawaii.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Thomas E. Morgan, of Pennsylvania, chairman; Clement J. Zablocki, of Wisconsin; Omar Burleson, of Texas; Edna F. Kelly, of New York; Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio; Armistead I. Selden, Jr., of Alabama; J. L. Pilcher, of Georgia; Barratt O'Hara, of Illinois; L. H. Fountain, of North Carolina; Dante B. Fascell, of Florida; Leonard Farbstein, of New York; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., of Michigan; Lindley Beckworth, of Texas; Harris B. McDowell, Jr., of Delaware; William T. Murphy, of Illinois; Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey; Robert N. C. Nix, of Pennsylvania; John S. Monagan, of Connecticut; Donald M. Fraser, of Minnesota; Ronald Brooks Cameron, of California.

Committee on Government Operations: William L. Dawson, of Illinois, chairman; Chet Holifield, of California; Jack Brooks, of Texas; L. H. Fountain, of North Carolina; Porter Hardy, Jr., of Virginia; John A. Blatnik, of Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, of Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, of Maryland; John E. Moss, of California; Dante B. Fascell, of Florida; Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin; John S. Monagan, of Connecticut; Richard E. Lankford, of Maryland; Torbert H. Macdonald, of Massachusetts; J. Edward Roush, of Indiana; William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania; Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey; Wm. J. Randall, of Missouri; Benjamin S. Rosenthal, of New York.

Committee on House Administration: Omar Burleson, of Texas, chairman; Samuel N. Friedel, of Maryland; Robert T. Ashmore, of South Carolina; Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio; Paul C. Jones, of Missouri; George M. Rhodes, of Pennsylvania; Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey; Watkins M. Abbitt, of Virginia; Robert A. Everett, of Tennessee; John J. McFall, of California; Joe D. Waggoner, Jr., of Louisiana; Carl D. Perkins, of Kentucky; John H. Dent, of Pennsylvania; Sam M. Gibbons, of Florida.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Wayne N. Aspinall, of Colorado, chairman; Leo W. O'Brien, of New York; Walter Rogers, of Texas; James A. Haley, of Florida; Ed Edmondson, of Oklahoma; Walter S. Baring, of Nevada; Thomas G. Morris, of New Mexico; Ralph J. Rivers, of Alaska; Roy A. Taylor, of North Carolina; Harold T. Johnson, of California; Hugh L. Carey, of New York;

Morris K. Udall, of Arizona; Elizabeth Kee, of West Virginia; Ray Roberts, of Texas; Robert B. Duncan, of Oregon; Compton I. White, Jr., of Idaho; John O. Marsh, Jr., of Virginia; Edward R. Roybal, of California; Thomas P. Gill, of Hawaii.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Oren Harris, of Arkansas, chairman; John Bell Williams, of Mississippi; Kenneth A. Roberts, of Alabama; Harley O. Staggers, of West Virginia; Walter Rogers, of Texas; Samuel N. Friedel, of Maryland; Torbert H. Macdonald, of Massachusetts; George M. Rhodes, of Pennsylvania; John Jarman, of Oklahoma; Leo W. O'Brien, of New York; John E. Moss, of California; John D. Dingell, of Michigan; Paul G. Rogers, of Florida; Robert W. Hemphill, of South Carolina; Dan Rostenkowski, of Illinois; James C. Healey, of New York; Horace R. Kornegay, of North Carolina; W. R. Hull, Jr., of Missouri; Gillis William Long, of Louisiana; Lionel Van Deerlin, of California.

Committee on the Judiciary: Emanuel Celler, of New York, chairman; Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania; Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio; Frank Chelf, of Kentucky; Edwin E. Willis, of Louisiana; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., of New Jersey; E. L. Forrester, of Georgia; Byron G. Rogers, of Colorado; Harold D. Donohue, of Massachusetts; Jack Brooks, of Texas; William M. Tuck, of Virginia; Robert T. Ashmore, of South Carolina; John Dowdy, of Texas; Basil L. Whitener, of North Carolina; Roland V. Libonati, of Illinois; Herman Toll, of Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kastenmeier, of Wisconsin; Jacob H. Gilbert, of New York; James C. Corman, of California; William L. St. Onge, of Connecticut; George F. Senner, Jr., of Arizona.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, chairman; Edward A. Garmatz, of Maryland; Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan, of Missouri; T. A. Thompson, of Louisiana; Frank M. Clark, of Pennsylvania; Thomas L. Ashley, of Ohio; John D. Dingell, of Michigan; L. Mendel Rivers, of South Carolina; Alton Lennon, of North Carolina; Thomas N. Downing, of Virginia; Bob Casey, of Texas; James A. Byrne, of Pennsylvania; Charles A. Vanik, of Ohio; Harlan Hagen, of California; Edith Green, of Oregon; Paul G. Rogers, of Florida; Frank A. Stubblefield, of Kentucky; John M. Murphy, of New York.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray, of Tennessee, chairman; James H. Morrison, of Louisiana; Thaddeus J. Dulski, of New York; David N. Henderson, of North Carolina; Arnold Olsen, of Montana; Morris K. Udall, of Arizona; Dominick V. Daniels, of New Jersey; Lindley Beckworth, of Texas; Harley O. Staggers, of West Virginia; Robert N. C. Nix, of Pennsylvania; Everett G. Burkhalter, of California; W. Donlon Edwards, of California; Joe R. Pool, of Texas; Albert W. Watson, of South Carolina.

Committee on Public Works: Charles A. Buckley, of New York, chairman; George H. Fallon, of Maryland; Clifford Davis, of Tennessee; John A. Blatnik, of Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, of Alabama; John C. Kluczynski, of Illinois; T. A. Thompson, of Louisiana; Jim Wright, of Texas; Kenneth J. Gray, of Illinois; Frank M. Clark, of Pennsylvania; Ed Edmondson, of Oklahoma; John J. McFall, of California; John Young, of Texas; Harold T. Johnson, of California; W. J. Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina; David N. Henderson, of North Carolina; Arnold Olsen, of Montana; Harold M. Ryan, of Michigan; J. Russell Tuten, of Georgia; John M. Murphy, of New York.

Committee on Rules: Howard W. Smith, of Virginia, chairman; William M. Colmer, of Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, of Indiana; James J. Delaney, of New York; James W. Trimble, of Arkansas; Homer Thornberry, of Texas; Richard Bolling, of Missouri; Thomas

P. O'Neill, Jr., of Massachusetts; Carl Elliott, of Alabama; B. F. Sisk, of California.

Committee on Science and Astronautics: George P. Miller, of California, chairman; Olin E. Teague, of Texas; Joseph E. Karth, of Minnesota; Ken Hechler, of West Virginia; Emilio Q. Daddario, of Connecticut; J. Edward Roush, of Indiana; Thomas G. Morris, of New Mexico; Bob Casey, of Texas; Wm. J. Randall, of Missouri; John W. Davis, of Georgia; William Fitts Ryan, of New York; Thomas N. Downing, of Virginia; Joe D. Waggoner, Jr., of Louisiana; Edward J. Patten, of New Jersey; Richard Fulton, of Tennessee; Don Fuqua, of Florida; Neil Staebler, of Michigan; Carl Albert, of Oklahoma.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, chairman; Clyde Doyle, of California; Edwin E. Willis, of Louisiana; William M. Tuck, of Virginia; Joe R. Pool, of Texas.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Olin E. Teague, of Texas, chairman; W. J. Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina; Elizabeth Kee, of West Virginia; James A. Haley, of Florida; Walter S. Baring, of Nevada; Robert A. Everett, of Tennessee; Thaddeus J. Dulski, of New York; Roland V. Libonati, of Illinois; Har- ris B. McDowell, Jr., of Delaware; Horace R. Kornegay, of North Carolina; Ray Roberts, of Texas; Robert T. Secrest, of Ohio; W. Donlon Edwards, of California; John O. Marsh, Jr., of Virginia; George E. Brown, Jr., of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 110) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: Ben F. Jensen, of Iowa; Walt Horan, of Washington; Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan; Harold C. Ostertag, of New York; Frank T. Bow, of Ohio; Charles Raper Jonas, of North Carolina; Melvin R. Laird, of Wisconsin; Elford A. Cederberg, of Michigan; Glenard P. Lipscomb, of California; John J. Rhodes, of Arizona; John R. Pillion, of New York; William E. Minshall, of Ohio; Robert H. Michel, of Illinois; Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts; William H. Milliken, Jr., of Pennsylvania; Earl Wilson, of Indiana; Odin Langen, of Minnesota.

Committee on House Administration: Paul F. Schenck, of Ohio; Robert J. Corbett, of Pennsylvania; John B. Bennett, of Michigan; Glenard P. Lipscomb, of California; Charles E. Chamberlain, of Michigan; Charles E. Goodell, of New York; John Kyl, of Iowa; John B. Anderson, of Illinois.

Committee on Rules: Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio; Katharine St. George, of New York; H. Allen Smith, of California; Elmer J. Hoffman, of Illinois; William H. Avery, of Kansas.

Committee on Ways and Means: John W. Byrnes, of Wisconsin; Howard H. Baker, of Tennessee; Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri; Victor A. Knox, of Michigan; James B. Utt, of California; Jackson E. Betts, of Ohio; Bruce Alger, of Texas; Steven B. Derounian, of New York; Herman T. Schneebeli, of Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINORITY WHIP AND CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Republican conference, it is my privilege to report to the House that the Republican conference has unanimously approved the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] as minority whip and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] as the chairman of the Republican policy committee.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the 88th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 15 United States Code 1024(a), as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Economic Committee the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. PATMAN, of Texas; Mr. BOLLING, of Missouri; Mr. Boggs, of Louisiana; Mr. REUSS, of Wisconsin; Mrs. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan; Mr. CURTIS, of Missouri; Mr. KILBURN, of New York; and Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 15, 1963.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 12 noon on January 15, 1963, and said to contain the annual report of the National Science Foundation.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

TWELFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 39)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 12th Annual Report of the Na-

tional Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 15, 1963.

BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT, 1964 (H. DOC. NO. 15)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

With this message I present the budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

The Federal budget has a double importance: It is an agenda of our purposes and priorities in the form of a plan for the conduct and financing of the public business. It is also the most powerful single tool the Nation possesses for linking the private and public sectors of our economy in a common effort to achieve and maintain national prosperity. This budget presents a financial plan for the efficient and frugal conduct of the public business, and it proposes measures to set the United States firmly on the road to maximum production, employment, and purchasing power.

This budget is presented in a national economic climate which is greatly improved over that of 2 years ago, but which is capable of substantial further improvement. In the last 2 years, our total real output of goods and services has increased by 9 percent; total wage payments have risen by 10 percent; corporate profits have gone up by 18 percent; and well over a million additional nonfarm jobs have been created. At the same time, the price level of the United States has been one of the most stable in the world, and we have substantially reduced the deficit in our balance of payments.

Nevertheless, we cannot rest on this record. The performance of the economy in 1962 fell below our expectations. The gap between economic performance and potential which opened up in 1957 has not yet been closed. Unutilized productive capacity remains too large, and unemployment remains too high. Our rate of economic growth lags behind our capability. We must not allow the progress of the last 2 years to blunt the recognition that our economy can produce both more jobs and greater abundance than it is now doing.

Our economy has been falling short of its productive potential for more than 5 years because total demand for goods and services by consumers and business firms has been insufficient to keep the economy operating at capacity. Yet, in the face of this persistent inadequacy of overall demand, the purchases of consumers and business firms have been restrained by tax and other collections—Federal, State, and local—which now total over \$150 billion a year.

The checkrein of taxes on private spending and productive incentives must be loosened if our economy is to perform

at maximum efficiency. To that end—as I pledged last year—the 1964 budget incorporates a major program of tax reduction and reform, designed to help speed the economy toward full employment and a higher rate of growth with price stability.

Although, with the passage of time, the economic expansion induced by reduction in tax rates may be expected to yield a higher level of Government revenues than the present tax system affords, the initial effect of the proposed tax program will be a revenue loss. In this setting, I have felt obliged to limit severely my 1964 expenditure proposals. In national defense and space programs—where false economy would seriously jeopardize our national interest or even our national survival—I have proposed expenditure increases. Fixed interest charges on the debt will also rise. But total 1964 expenditures for all other programs in the administrative budget, taken together, have been held to this year's level, and even reduced somewhat. Within this total, increases have been confined to those areas most important to the Nation's current welfare and future growth, and these will be offset—indeed, slightly more than offset—by the reductions I am recommending in expenditures under other programs.

In presenting this budget as the Government's financial plan for 1964, I am giving major emphasis to a consolidated cash presentation, covering not only the administrative budget but also other Federal activities—mainly the social security, highway, and other trust funds. This provides a much more complete picture of governmental activities and finances than the administrative budget. It is in accord with recommendations made by nongovernmental groups and independent scholars that a more meaningful and comprehensive budgetary concept be used.

On this basis, after taking into account the revenue loss associated with my tax recommendations, total receipts from the public in fiscal year 1964 are estimated at \$112.2 billion, total payments to the public at \$122.5 billion, with a resulting excess of payments of \$10.3 billion.

This step toward consideration of the Government's program and budget in more complete form than heretofore entails no change in the legal status of the trust funds; the assets of these funds will be held inviolate as always. Moreover, the administrative budget, which has received the most attention in the past, continues to be identified. Using this older concept, which covers only Government-owned funds and thus excludes trust fund transactions, the outlook is for receipts of \$86.9 billion in 1964, expenditures of \$98.8 billion, and an excess of expenditures totaling \$11.9 billion.

A third concept of Federal finances, which is used in our national income accounts, provides an important measure of the economic impact of the Government's fiscal activities; Federal fiscal data in these terms are estimated on an accrual rather than a cash basis, including the trust funds but eliminating transactions not directly affecting pro-

duction and income. These data indicate an excess of expenditures over receipts of \$7.6 billion in fiscal year 1964.

Whichever measure is used, the immediate effect of my proposed tax program will be to increase the deficit which would otherwise be incurred in the coming fiscal year. In accepting this prospect, I have considered both the lessons of the recent past and the outlook for the future.

The sluggish rate of economic growth in recent years has not produced the revenues required to obtain budget surpluses under our present tax system. During the past 5 fiscal years, on an administrative budget basis, the Government's cumulative deficits totaled \$24.3 billion, in marked contrast with the original budget estimates of cumulative surpluses totaling \$8.0 billion. The major reason for the shortfall was the continued failure of the economy to reach the levels which had been assumed as reasonable. It is now clear that the restraining effects of the tax system on the economy were not adequately recognized.

Summary of Federal receipts and payments (Fiscal years. In billions)

Description	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Federal receipts:			
Administrative budget receipts.....	\$81.4	\$85.5	\$86.9
Trust fund receipts.....	24.3	26.9	29.5
Deduct intragovernmental transactions...	3.8	3.9	4.2
Total cash receipts from the public...	101.9	108.4	112.2
Add adjustment from cash to accrual basis...	2.5	1.4	— .1
Deduct receipts from loans, property sales, and other adjustments	.4	1.0	.7
National income account receipts—Federal sector....	104.0	108.8	111.4
Federal payments:			
Administrative budget expenditures.....	\$7.8	\$9.3	\$9.8
Trust fund expenditures (including Government-sponsored enterprises).....	25.2	27.3	28.4
Deduct intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments.....	5.3	4.8	4.7
Total cash payments to the public.....	107.7	116.8	122.5
Add adjustment from cash to accrual basis...	.9	.3	— .1
Deduct disbursements for loans, land purchases, and other adjustments.....	2.9	3.9	3.4
National income account expenditures—Federal sector....	105.7	113.2	119.0
Excess of receipts (+) or payments (—):			
Administrative budget. Receipts from and payments to the public...	—6.4	—8.8	—11.9
National income accounts—Federal sector.....	—1.7	—4.3	—7.6

NOTE.—Receipts, including those on a national income account basis, reflect retroactively to Jan. 1, 1962, revenue losses occasioned by both the Revenue Act of 1962 and the 1962 administrative depreciation reform. To this extent, receipts shown for fiscal 1962 differ from those published to date by the Department of Commerce in the national income accounts.

This issue must be faced squarely. Our present choice is not between a tax

cut and a balanced budget. The choice, rather, is between chronic deficits arising out of a slow rate of economic growth, and temporary deficits stemming from a tax program designed to promote fuller use of our resources and more rapid economic growth. Considerations of sound fiscal policy as well as concern for the Nation's economic well-being have led me to the conviction that the latter choice is the only sensible one. Unless we release the tax brake which is holding back our economy, it is likely to continue to operate below its potential. Federal receipts are likely to remain disappointingly low, and budget deficits are likely to persist. Adoption of the tax program I am proposing will strengthen our Nation's economic vitality, and by so doing, will provide the basis for sharply increased budget revenues in future years.

Nevertheless, the prospect of expanding economic activity and rising Federal revenues in the years ahead does not mean that Federal outlays should rise in proportion to such revenue increases. As the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the revenue increases must go toward eliminating the transitional deficit. Although it will be necessary to increase certain expenditures, we shall continue, and indeed intensify, our effort to include in our fiscal program only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of fulfilling important national needs. Federal outlays must be incurred only where the resulting benefits to the security and well-being of the American people are clearly worth the costs.

Furthermore, we shall maintain pressure on each department and agency to improve its productivity and efficiency. Through improved management techniques, installation of modern equipment, and better coordination of agency programs, important productivity gains have already been realized, and further advances will be forthcoming. I mean to insure that in each of the various Federal programs, objectives are achieved at the lowest possible cost.

The Federal deficit which will be incurred in fiscal year 1964 should neither raise fears of inflation nor cause increased concern about our balance of international payments. With the tools of monetary policy and debt management always available, our program for sustained economic expansion with increasing productivity is an objective quite compatible with continuance of the relative price stability we have known in recent years; this is of importance not only at home but also for our foreign trade. Moreover, the favorable effects of a strong economic expansion on the profitability of domestic investment and on the productivity of American industry, in combination with all of our efforts to achieve balance-of-payments equilibrium, will contribute to the strength of the dollar, as our friends abroad increasingly recognize.

TAX RECOMMENDATIONS AND RECEIPTS

My tax proposals include substantial permanent reductions in individual and

corporation income tax rates as well as a number of important structural changes designed to encourage economic growth, increase the equity of our tax system, and simplify our tax laws and administration. Some reductions in rates would start in the calendar year 1963. The remainder of the program, including additional income tax rate reductions for both individuals and corporations, together with structural reforms and other revisions, would become effective in 1964 and 1965. The entire tax program, which I will shortly recommend to the Congress as a single comprehensive measure, is a major step in the effort to strengthen and improve our tax system.

The recommended tax rate reductions extend over every bracket of individual income tax rates. The largest proportionate tax reductions, measured as a percentage of tax liability and in relation to the total revenue loss to the Government, are proposed for those with the lowest incomes. The recommendations also provide for more equitable tax treatment through changes affecting the tax base and remove certain tax concessions that will be no longer appropriate. In every respect, the proposals are consistent with generally accepted American standards of fair play, while at the same time they are designed to provide needed economic incentives.

The proposed corporation income tax reductions are supplemented by recommended structural changes to strengthen the position of small business and to correct distortions in the existing structure which result in the misallocation of energy and resources. Part of the loss in Treasury tax collections attributable to rate reductions would be offset by the introduction of a gradual program to place payment of income tax liabilities of large corporations on a more current basis.

Receipts from the public

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Source	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Administrative budget receipts:			
Individual income taxes	\$45.6	\$47.3	\$45.8
Corporation income taxes	20.5	21.2	23.8
Excise taxes	9.6	9.9	10.4
Other	5.7	7.1	6.9
Total, administrative budget receipts	81.4	85.5	86.9
Trust fund receipts:			
Employment taxes	12.6	14.8	16.6
Deposits by States, unemployment insurance	2.7	2.8	2.8
Excise taxes	2.9	3.2	3.3
Federal employee and agency payments for retirement	1.8	1.8	1.9
Interest on trust investments	1.4	1.5	1.6
Veterans life insurance premiums	.5	.5	.5
Other	2.4	2.3	2.9
Total, trust fund receipts	24.3	26.9	29.5
Intragovernmental transactions (deduct)	3.8	3.9	4.2
Total receipts from the public	101.9	108.4	112.2

The proposed tax program, when fully effective, would reduce tax liabilities by about \$10 billion compared to the present tax system, when both calculations are based on the same calendar year 1963 levels of income. Incomes, however, will not be the same under the new tax program. Because my proposals incorporate lower rates of taxation as well as tax reform measures, they will stimulate economic activity and so raise the levels of personal and corporate income as to yield within a few years an increased—not a reduced—flow of revenues to the Federal Government.

Revenue estimates: Estimates of Federal receipts must be based upon specific economic assumptions. The revenue estimates in this budget assume a gross national product in the calendar year 1963 of \$578 billion. This figure is the midpoint of a range of expectation which extends \$5 billion on each side. The anticipated rise in the gross national product from the calendar 1962 level of \$554 billion takes into account some initial economic stimulus expected from adoption of my tax recommendations.

That part of the proposed reductions in tax rates becoming effective in calendar 1963 would, by itself, reduce fiscal 1964 tax revenues by some \$5.3 billion. Placing the payment of corporate income taxes on a more current basis, however, will reduce this revenue loss, as will the initial spur provided by the tax program to private production and incomes. Taking account of these factors, the net revenue loss in fiscal 1964 from my tax program is estimated at \$2.7 billion. Despite this revenue loss, administrative budget receipts are estimated to rise by \$1.4 billion in fiscal year 1964 because of the anticipated expansion in economic activity.

As we learned again this past year, there are many uncertainties in estimating economic developments and Federal revenues so far ahead. If the economy grows more strongly and quickly than we now foresee, revenues would be higher than now estimated. On the other hand—although I consider this unlikely if my proposals are approved promptly by the Congress—slower growth in the economy would be accompanied by smaller revenues. This would indeed be unfortunate, both because of the effect on Government finances, and because of the lost opportunities and the human misfortune that would accompany a sluggish economy and growing unemployment.

Tax extension: Legislation is needed to extend certain excise tax rates for another year. Without such legislation, these tax rates would be reduced or would expire on July 1, 1963, resulting in a revenue loss in fiscal year 1964 of \$1.6 billion.

Under present law, the maximum corporation income tax rate would be reduced from 52 percent to 47 percent on July 1, 1963. My legislative proposals include an extension of the 52-percent maximum rate for 6 months, but provide, in accordance with my tax program, for certain changes in the tax

treatment of corporations which will also be applicable to that period.

User charges: I am renewing the recommendations I made last year for the enactment of a series of user charges for commercial and general aviation and for transportation on inland waterways. The purpose of the recommendations is to assure that passengers and shippers who benefit from special Government programs will bear a more equitable share of the costs of these programs. Appropriate fees should also be assessed in other areas in which the Government provides special benefits or conveys special privileges to the users and beneficiaries. Where new legislation is needed to carry out this policy—such as to update the schedule of fees for issuing patents, established in 1932—the necessary proposals will be sent to the Congress.

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

The expenditure program which I am proposing in this budget is, I believe, the minimum necessary to meet the essential needs of our complex and growing society in an era of cold war.

All levels of Government have been subject to sharp pressures for increased expenditures during the postwar period as our population has grown, as wages and prices have risen, and as demands for improved governmental services have expanded. Since 1948 State and local government expenditures have more than trebled and Federal expenditures for nondefense purposes, including a rapidly expanding level of grants-in-aid to State and local governments, have more than doubled. The Federal Government has also borne a sharply increased burden in the areas of national defense, international affairs, and space.

In this budget for 1964, most of the increase in expenditures over the current year is also for national security and space programs, carrying forward efforts already begun to strengthen our defenses and to participate more actively in man's attempt to explore outer space. Expenditures for fixed interest charges and for activities financed through trust funds will also increase, chiefly reflecting continued expansions in the self-financed social security and highway programs.

The total of administrative budget expenditures for all other programs, combined, has been held slightly below the 1963 level, despite the fact that we face such rising costs as the second step of the civilian employee pay reform enacted last year and various increases under program commitments already made, such as urban renewal and public assistance grants.

Other moderate expenditure increases being proposed within the reduced total represent a necessary payment on future progress and should not be postponed. They include new programs and increases in present programs for education and health, which are investments in our human resources; retraining for those whose present skills are no longer in strong demand; enlargement of employment opportunities for young people who have left school; redevelopment of depressed areas, including the program enacted last year for accelerating

public works in these areas; improvement of urban areas through better transportation and more adequate housing, especially for moderate-income families; and encouragement of science and technology important to our civilian industries.

Payments to the public

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Function	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Administrative budget expenditures:			
National defense.....	\$51.1	\$53.0	\$55.4
Space research and technology.....	1.3	2.4	4.2
Interest.....	9.2	9.8	10.1
Subtotal.....	61.6	65.2	69.7
All other functions:			
International affairs and finance.....	2.8	2.9	2.7
Agriculture and agricultural resources.....	5.9	6.7	5.7
Natural resources.....	2.1	2.4	2.5
Commerce and transportation.....	2.8	3.3	3.4
Housing and community development.....	.3	.5	.3
Health, labor, and welfare.....	4.5	4.9	5.6
Education.....	1.1	1.4	1.5
Veterans benefits and services.....	5.4	5.5	5.5
General government.....	1.9	2.0	2.2
Subtotal, all other functions.....	26.9	29.7	29.4
Allowances:			
Comparability pay adjustment.....			.2
Contingencies.....		.1	.2
Interfund transactions (deduct).....	.6	.6	.7
Total, administrative budget expenditures.....	87.8	94.3	98.8
Trust fund expenditures:			
Health, labor, and welfare.....	20.4	21.8	22.8
Commerce and transportation.....	2.7	2.9	3.2
Housing and community development.....	1.5	.5	1.0
Veterans benefits and services.....	.7	.9	.6
All other.....	.4	1.7	1.2
Interfund transactions (deduct).....	.5	.5	.5
Total, trust fund expenditures.....	25.2	27.3	28.4
Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments (deduct).....	5.3	4.8	4.7
Total payments to the public.....	107.7	116.8	122.5

These increases are offset by decreases in other administrative budget expenditures. For example, lower expenditures are estimated for the postal service, as a result of a full year's return on the rate increases enacted last year; for certain housing, international, and other lending programs, through substitution of private for public credit; and for agricultural price supports.

National defense: There is no discount price on defense. The free world must be prepared at all times to face the perils of global nuclear war, limited conventional conflict, and covert guerrilla activities.

The 1964 budget carries forward this administration's policies to develop and strengthen the flexible and balanced forces needed to guard against each of these hazards, and to equip and operate these forces at the lowest possible cost. For the coming year, total expenditures for national defense are estimated at

\$56.0 billion, of which \$55.4 billion are administrative budget expenditures. This is about \$10 billion more than the level of expenditures in 1960 and, together with the growth in the space program, accounts for the major part of the increase in the budget since this administration took office.

The 1964 budget proposals for national defense continue the emphasis which in recent years we have placed on:

A strong strategic retaliatory force capable of surviving a surprise attack and responding effectively in a controlled and flexible manner against the aggressor. Additional numbers of land-based Minuteman missiles will be procured and placed in hardened and dispersed sites. Six more Polaris submarines will be procured, and further work done on improved versions of the Minuteman and Polaris missiles.

Improved air and missile defense forces. Our antibomber defense system and our ballistic missile warning systems will be strengthened. High levels of effort will continue on developing a defense against missiles, including further testing of the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile and initial development of the more advanced Nike-X surface-to-air missile.

More powerful and flexible conventional forces—ground, sea, and air—to increase the range of nonnuclear response to aggression. Procurement of conventional weapons, equipment, ammunition, helicopters, and Air Force tactical fighter and reconnaissance aircraft for more effective support of ground units will be speeded. Provision is made for 16 combat-ready Army divisions, 3 divisions and air wings in the Marine Corps, further modernization of the naval fleet, and an additional 15,000 men for the Army to test the concept of an air assault division and other new air units.

A civil defense fallout shelter program to improve the chances that a large portion of our population would survive a possible nuclear attack.

Strengthened counterinsurgency forces to help our allies deal with Communist subversion and covert armed aggression within their frontiers.

In this era of increasingly complex weapons and military systems, a large part of the effectiveness of our defense establishment depends on the retention of well-trained and devoted personnel in the Armed Forces. General military pay was last increased 4½ years ago. Since then, higher wages and salaries in private industry have provided strong inducement for highly trained military personnel to leave the service for better paying jobs in civilian life. To help meet this serious problem, and in fairness to the dedicated personnel in our Armed Forces, I will shortly submit to the Congress specific recommendations for increases in military compensation rates effective October 1, 1963.

Space research and technology: The accelerated programs for exploration and use of outer space moved ahead vigorously during the past year, and further significant advances are anticipated in the year ahead. This budget provides for an increase of \$2 billion

in appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to proceed with the top priority manned lunar landing program and with its wide range of programs of scientific investigation and development of useful applications such as communications and meteorological satellites. Expenditures in 1964 are estimated to rise to \$4.2 billion, which is \$1.8 billion over the current year's level—an increase of 75 percent.

Efforts are being concentrated on the continued development of the complex Apollo spacecraft and the large Advanced Saturn launch vehicle needed to boost the Apollo to the moon. A lunar orbit rendezvous approach will be used to accomplish during this decade the first manned lunar landing. Under this technique the Apollo spacecraft will be boosted directly into orbit around the moon, where a small manned lunar excursion module will be detached and descend to the surface of the moon. It will later return to the orbiting Apollo which will return to the earth.

The recent Mariner flight past Venus attests to the progress we are making in unmanned space investigations. Development of geophysical, astronomical, meteorological, and communications satellites will also continue. This budget provides for strong research efforts aimed at developing the technology needed for advanced space missions, including future manned space flight and unmanned explorations of Venus and Mars.

International affairs and finance: We are steadfast in our determination to promote the security of the free world, not only through our commitment to join in the defense of freedom, but also through our pledge to contribute to the economic and social development of less privileged, independent peoples. The attack on India by Communist China, and Vietnam's continuing struggle against massive armed subversion supported from without, are current reminders of the need and importance of our assistance. The increasing pace of modernization and the mounting efforts at reform and self-help in many nations merit our support and encouragement.

I am convinced that the budgetary amounts proposed are essential to meet our commitments and achieve our purposes. The basic objective of these international military and economic expenditures is to serve the security interests of the United States. Because these programs are often addressed to complex problems in distant lands, their contribution to our security objectives is not always directly apparent, but it is nonetheless vital. And because the problems we encounter are grave and complex, they present us with a constant challenge to improve content, administrative efficiency, and overall effectiveness.

Fundamental to our efforts is recognition that we are dealing with a combination of military, political, and economic measures which must be complementary and reinforcing. Our overseas military assistance program is vital to assure the

continued survival of independent states so situated that they are prime targets for open aggression or subversion. While direct military assistance greatly enhances the ability of these less developed countries to defend themselves and thus contributes to the peace and security of the free world, their contribution depends ultimately upon the strength of their economic and social structures. The economic and social development process is long and arduous, primarily dependent upon the efforts of the less developed nations themselves. We must assist and accelerate this process by providing critical increments of material and human resources which, along with measures of self-help and reform, will ultimately spell success for these efforts.

Expenditures in fiscal year 1964 for military and economic assistance, combined, are estimated at \$3,750 million, \$100 million less than in the current year. In providing these sums, we will be highly selective, stressing projects and programs crucial to the rapid development of countries which are important to the maintenance of free world security and which demonstrate willingness and ability to marshal their own resources effectively.

Of special concern are the Latin American Republics, with whom we have joined in the Alliance for Progress. As our neighbors to the south undertake far-reaching economic and social reforms, we are pledged to provide a critical margin of resources necessary for the achievement of our common goals. In the fiscal year 1964 I am recommending a program which will provide a total of over \$1 billion for these countries through the Agency for International Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and the Food for Peace program. We shall also be according priority in this area to the highly successful program of the Peace Corps.

We are not alone in seeing the relationship between free world security and rapid economic and social development. Other free world countries, particularly the European countries and Japan, are increasing their oversea programs, and we will continue to encourage these nations to increase them further in both size and scope. Similarly, we must support and encourage development programs carried out under international auspices. Negotiations are now underway for replenishing and enlarging the resources of the International Development Association. After these negotiations are completed, I expect to ask the Congress to authorize U.S. agreement, thereby enabling the operations of this important international organization to be continued and expanded. I also expect to request an authorization for the United States to join in providing additional resources for the Inter-American Development Bank.

The authority of the Export-Import Bank to exercise its functions expires on June 30, 1963. I shall shortly propose legislation to extend the life of the Bank for 5 years and to increase its resources by \$2 billion, so that its significant con-

tribution to the expansion of our foreign trade can continue. Without a further increase in the Bank's resources, the legislation will also increase by \$1 billion the Bank's authorization for the highly successful programs of guarantees and insurance of exporter credits.

Agriculture and agricultural resources: To realize for the Nation as a whole the benefits of our increasingly efficient agriculture, farm production must be brought into line with domestic and export requirements, the incomes of persons engaged in farming must be maintained and increased, and constructive use must be made of the current agricultural abundance to raise the level of living of the Nation's low-income families and meet international needs through the food-for-peace program. As part of this effort, we must use the opportunities opened up by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to expand foreign markets for our farm products.

The temporary wheat and feed grain programs, as modified by legislation enacted in the last session of Congress, are continuing to supplement farm income and to reduce storage costs by achieving reductions of our excess stocks of these grains. However, new programs are needed for cotton and dairy products as well as for feed grains to enable us to utilize more effectively the benefits of increasing productive efficiency in agriculture and to reduce budgetary expenditures for farm programs. I shall be presenting to the Congress specific legislative proposals relating to these farm commodities.

Legislation is recommended to continue the food stamp program and funds are included to operate the program in 1964 at the same level as in 1963. In addition, the 1964 budget provides for a start on the broad land-use adjustment program and the enlarged loan program of the Farmers Home Administration authorized in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. These programs, along with some shifts in emphasis in existing programs of the Department of Agriculture, are an essential part of our rural areas development program—a significant undertaking to cope with problems of unemployment, underemployment, and poverty in rural areas.

Federal payments in 1964 for all agricultural programs are estimated at \$5.8 billion, a reduction of \$1.1 billion from the 1963 level. This reduction results largely from anticipated substantial sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation in 1964 of cotton expected to be placed under price support in 1963. In addition, legislation is being proposed to increase the role of private financing in the rural housing program.

Natural resources: Orderly conservation and development of our natural resources are required to meet our future needs and to promote longrun economic growth. Expenditures of \$2.6 billion are estimated in 1964 for these purposes.

The budget provides for continued water resources development through projects for flood control, navigation, irrigation, water supply, hydroelectric power, and related recreational and wild-

life development. Funds are included for the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Tennessee Valley Authority to initiate construction on 43 new water resources projects with an estimated total Federal cost to completion of \$792 million.

Major emphasis is being given within the Federal Government to coordinated planning of river-basin development and research on water resources. In addition, legislation is again recommended to provide for comprehensive and coordinated water resources planning by Federal and State agencies and to authorize limited Federal grants to strengthen State planning.

I am requesting funds to start construction of major extra-high-voltage interconnections linking the electric systems of the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest. The interconnections will provide for the sale and exchange of power between California and the Northwest, resulting in substantial economies to both regions. Prompt action is expected on legislation proposed last year to reserve necessary power supplies for the Pacific Northwest.

The provision of adequate outdoor recreational opportunities for our growing population continues to be a pressing problem. Legislation will shortly be transmitted to the Congress to assist the States in the solution of this problem and to provide for Federal acquisition of certain lands to be devoted to recreational and conservation uses.

Commerce and transportation: I am gratified that the Congress enacted higher postal rates last year, permitting a reduction in net expenditures for the postal service in 1964. Expenditures for maritime operating subsidies are also estimated to be less in 1964 than in 1963. Despite these decreases, total Federal payments for commerce and transportation programs are expected to increase by \$444 million to \$6.7 billion in 1964. An estimated increase in grants to States for highway construction through the self-financed highway trust fund amounts to almost nine-tenths of the total rise; the remainder covers such recently enacted programs as area redevelopment, trade promotion, and acceleration of capital improvements in areas of substantial unemployment, as well as such older activities as small business loans and weather services.

To achieve a higher longrun rate of economic growth, and to take full advantage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 by competing successfully in the great markets of Europe and the developing nations of Africa and Asia, it is essential that we retain our current position of technological leadership in many industries. Accordingly, the Secretary of Commerce is undertaking a new program with the specific aim of stimulating through industrial research and development innovation in our civilian industrial technology. As an immediate step to help improve our balance of payments, I am recommending a substantial increase in the export expansion program.

Studies are progressing on the economic and technical feasibility of developing a supersonic air transport. I have directed that these studies be expedited and the results evaluated as soon as practicable.

The national transportation policy which I proposed last year is based upon greater reliance on competitive free enterprise, with less Federal regulation and subsidies. Under this approach, the Government would emphasize equal opportunity for all types of transportation. I hope that the new Congress will act promptly along the lines recommended previously to authorize the basic changes needed in existing law.

Housing and community development: The development and rehabilitation of urban areas and the provision of adequate housing for all our citizens stand high among the Nation's objectives. To this end the new and broader housing and community development programs authorized in the Housing Act of 1961 will be carried forward at an accelerated pace in 1964. Commitments made in earlier years will result in increased expenditures for urban renewal grants and for mortgage purchases and loans to help provide adequate housing for low and moderate income families as well as for elderly persons. Several possible methods for improving the provision of housing for low-income groups are currently being tested. Moreover, Federal loans are being made to improve public facilities in smaller communities and in areas of substantial unemployment.

I urge the Congress to enact promptly legislation, along the lines I proposed last year, to provide Federal aid to help urban areas solve their mass transportation problems.

The Federal Government is not properly organized at present to deal efficiently and effectively with the pressing problems of urban areas. I again recommend strongly that the Congress establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing to give urgently needed leadership in the solution of these problems.

Federal expenditures for housing and community development will rise from the current year's level of \$874 million to \$1.1 billion in fiscal year 1964. The substantial progress which will be made in this area will be financed in part through the substitution of private for public credit in a number of mortgage insurance and purchase programs.

Health, labor, and welfare: One of our most important national purposes must continue to be the strengthening of human resources. A strong defense and a revitalized economy require a trained and productive labor force, relentless warfare on illness and disease, and continued progress in extending economic security to those in our society who lack the means to provide adequately for their own basic needs.

Under existing health programs, the budget provides for strengthening the National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration, for improving community and environmental health protection, and for combating

mental illness and mental retardation. In addition, new legislation is proposed: to expand further the fight against mental illness and mental retardation; to broaden the scope and enlarge the authorization provided for construction of medical facilities in the Hill-Burton Act; and to authorize a new program to assist in the construction of medical schools.

I am also again proposing health insurance for aged persons, to be financed mainly through the social security system, but with benefits for those not covered by social security to be paid from regular appropriations.

To strengthen further the Government's labor and manpower activities, the budget includes funds to improve the Federal-State employment service, and I am again recommending legislation to revise the Federal-State unemployment insurance program so that the needs of the unemployed will be more fully met in both good and bad times. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, funds are included to provide training services to 140,000 unemployed workers in the coming fiscal year, and legislation is proposed to provide urgently needed opportunities for training and employment to the youth of our Nation.

Legislation is recommended to create a National Service Corps to help by example to strengthen the volunteer spirit in the provision of social services in our local communities.

Federal payments for health, labor, and welfare programs in 1964 are estimated to rise by \$1.6 billion to \$27.4 billion, of which over 80 percent will be paid from trust funds.

Education: A strong educational system is necessary for the maintenance of a free society and a growing economy. Inadequacies in our educational system present serious obstacles to the achievement of important national objectives and prevent able individuals from obtaining the high quality training to which they should have ready access.

In these circumstances Federal action becomes imperative, but the Federal Government can provide only a small part of the funds in an area where outlays from all sources approximate \$30 billion annually. Accordingly, I am recommending a program carefully designed to provide a major impetus to the solution of a selected number of critical educational problems.

This program, which will be outlined more fully in a special message, proposes significant new activities and greater utilization of the existing authority of the Office of Education. It also proposes greater use of the authority of the National Science Foundation to support science and engineering education. It is designed, first, to obtain improved quality in all levels and types of education; second, to help break crucial bottlenecks in the capacity of our educational system by providing funds for building expansion; and third, to increase opportunities for individuals to obtain education and training by broadening and facilitating access to colleges and universities and

by providing an expanded range of technical, vocational, and professional training opportunities for teachers and students.

A recommended substantial augmentation of basic research by the National Science Foundation—necessary to progress in science and technology—will also contribute materially to graduate education.

This budget provides new obligational authority of \$3 billion for education programs in fiscal year 1964, of which \$1.5 billion is under proposed legislation. Expenditures are estimated to rise by \$165 million to \$1.5 billion.

Veterans benefits and services: This country has recognized that the Government's primary obligation for veterans benefits is to those who incurred disabilities in the defense of our Nation and to the dependents of those who died as a result of military service. In keeping with this principle, the 87th Congress enacted a new program of vocational rehabilitation for servicemen disabled while in the Armed Forces and a cost-of-living increase in disability compensation rates. I recommend that the Congress enact a similar increase in benefits for the children and dependent parents of veterans who died as a result of military service.

Emphasis in veterans programs should continue to be placed on benefits and care for the service disabled. This policy recognizes that veterans are increasingly benefited by the rapidly expanding general health, education, and welfare programs of the Government. Excluding these general benefits, total Federal payments for veterans programs in 1964 are estimated at \$6 billion.

EXPENDITURES OF AN INVESTMENT NATURE

Success in achieving a higher rate of economic growth in the future depends, in large part, on our willingness to devote current resources to enlarging the Nation's capacity to produce goods and services in future years. About one-seventh of the expenditures proposed for 1964 are for activities which will promote increased productivity and economic growth, yielding substantial benefits in the future.

For example, the fiscal year 1964 program includes \$10.8 billion of budget and trust fund expenditures for Federal civil public works; for highways, hospitals, and other additions to State, local, and private assets; for loans for such activities as rural electrification, education, and small business operations; and for other additions to Federal assets.

The Federal Government will also contribute directly and indirectly to economic growth through its support of more than two-thirds of all the scientific research and development undertaken in the Nation. Expenditures for research and development other than for national defense and space are expected to rise to \$1.6 billion in fiscal year 1964. Moreover, the additional \$8.8 billion devoted to defense research and development, including atomic energy, and the \$3.6 billion devoted to space research and development, will produce many col-

lateral benefits to the civilian sector of the economy as well.

Furthermore, during fiscal year 1964 an estimated \$1.6 billion will be spent for nondefense education, training, and health programs, in addition to the amounts for facilities and loans. Apart from the intrinsic merits of these programs, helping to provide individuals with the opportunity to obtain the best medical care available and to maximize the development of their intellectual capacities and occupational skills improves the quality of the labor force. Indeed, growth in the Nation's education and skills has been a major factor in the longrun rise in the Nation's economic productivity.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES ABROAD

The United States continues to face a deficit in its international payments as we enter the calendar year 1963. As one part of the administration's program to reduce this deficit, the Federal Government, during the past year, has instituted a system of continuing review of all its activities affecting the balance of payments. This process is intended to insure that expenditures abroad for the Federal Government's activities are kept to the minimum consistent with our defense and other responsibilities at home and abroad.

In the preparation of the 1964 budget, all proposed expenditures which affect the balance of payments have received particular attention and review. Special efforts are being made to reduce Federal expenditures overseas without jeopardizing the defense of the free world. Measures already taken to assure maximum expenditure of foreign economic assistance funds in the United States will continue to reduce the portion of these funds spent abroad. We will continue to press ahead in the effort to encourage other nations, particularly European countries and Japan, to accept a greater share of the costs of economic aid to developing countries and to increase support for military defenses within their own borders.

The Federal Government is also seeking to increase receipts in the United States from foreign countries by obtaining advance repayments of loans previously made to them by this country and by promoting the purchase by foreign governments of military equipment in the United States. Continuing success is expected in these efforts during the coming year.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

To carry out the program I am recommending for fiscal year 1964, the Congress is being requested to enact new appropriations and other obligational authority totaling \$96.5 billion. This amount includes substantial increases for the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a large part of which will not be spent until later years. A sizable increase is also required for the Commodity Credit Corporation, to make up for losses incurred in past years under the price support and special export programs.

New obligational authority

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Total authorizations requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds.....	\$81.6	\$91.8	\$96.1
Trust funds.....	.3	.4	.4
Total authorizations not requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds.....	11.2	11.4	11.8
Trust funds.....	25.6	27.8	30.4
Total new obligational authority:			
Administrative budget funds.....	92.9	103.2	107.9
Trust funds.....	26.0	28.1	30.8

In addition, \$42.2 billion will become available under permanent authorization without action by the Congress this year. Of this amount, \$30.4 billion is for the trust funds, representing primarily the automatic appropriation to these funds of their own revenues. The largest permanent authorization in 1964 in the administrative budget is \$10.0 billion for interest on the public debt.

The Congress is also requested to enact new obligational authority for the current fiscal year, 1963, in addition to the amounts already provided, largely to finance legislation enacted last year for which no appropriations were enacted or for which only partial provision was made—such as employee pay reform, revisions in the grant formula for public assistance, and the program of accelerated public works in depressed areas. These and other supplementary requirements which the Congress is requested to enact, such as \$2.0 billion for the Export-Import Bank, are now estimated to total \$3.9 billion.

PUBLIC DEBT

Under present law, a temporary debt limitation of \$308 billion is now in effect. However, this limit will revert to \$305 billion on April 1, 1963, and to \$300 billion on June 25, 1963. After June 30, 1963, the permanent debt ceiling of \$285 billion again becomes effective.

Public debt at end of year

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1961 actual	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Owned by Federal agencies and trust funds.....	\$55.3	\$55.7	\$56.7	\$59.0
Owned privately and by Federal Reserve banks.....	233.7	242.5	246.8	256.6
Total.....	289.0	298.2	303.5	315.6

NOTE.—For further details, see table 11 in pt. 2 of this document.

The present temporary debt limit was enacted last July on the assumption, clearly stated in the report of the House Committee on Ways and Means, that the expansion in the economy and in tax revenues would be sufficient to produce a balanced budget for fiscal year 1963. It is now evident that receipts will not reach the level hoped for at that time. As a consequence, the pending step reductions in the temporary limit on the public debt would render impossible the

sound management of Government finances during the April-June quarter of 1963.

Although the total public debt subject to limitation is expected to decline to about \$304 billion after the receipt of tax payments due in June 1963, the pattern of receipts and expenditures will tend to cause the debt to rise substantially above the \$305 billion level at various times during those 3 months. Moreover, if the debt has to be held below this level, the Treasury would have little or no flexibility for taking advantage of favorable market conditions, or for dealing with any untoward developments in short-term interest rates which might complicate balance-of-payments problems. I therefore urge prompt extension of the temporary \$308 billion debt limit through the remainder of this fiscal year.

Seasonal variations in revenue will, as usual, cause the public debt to increase substantially from its June 30 level during the first half of fiscal 1964. The deficit foreseen for fiscal 1964 will add to this increase and it will prevent a seasonal decrease in the debt from taking place during the final months of the fiscal year. The debt subject to limit as of June 30, 1964, is estimated at about \$316 billion. To meet our financial requirements and to provide a margin of flexibility, I will request a further increase in the debt limit for fiscal 1964. The exact amount and nature of the increase required depends not only on the total amount of the deficit but also on the particular time pattern of receipts and expenditures. For this reason, the debt limit to be requested for fiscal year 1964 will be determined later this year when a more reliable estimate can be made of the requirements.

The financing of the cash deficits in fiscal years 1963 and 1964 can and will be accomplished without contributing to the development of inflationary pressures. During the past 2 calendar years, a basic aim of debt management policy has been to help assure that an adequate supply of credit would be available to support domestic expansion, while at the same time helping to maintain interest rates on short-term securities at levels that would deter flows to the other major money markets abroad. This policy has been successfully carried out. In the future, as in the past, debt management policies will be directed toward assuring that any increase in the debt will be so distributed in its ownership and composition as to promote continued price stability in the economy.

EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

In our society, Government expects continuing scrutiny and criticism of its efficiency. The search for greater efficiency is never finished. What was an efficient practice a few years ago may be obsolete today. New approaches to work practices, to information handling, and even to decisionmaking itself are the order of the day throughout Government as well as private industry.

In striving for greater efficiency, we are pressing forward on three major fronts: Management improvement, cost reduction, and the reform of our public salary systems.

Management improvement and cost reduction: This budget has been prepared with special attention to employment trends in the Federal Government. Requests for additional jobs have been reduced or denied wherever possible. Moreover, I have directed the heads of departments and agencies to join in a Government-wide program to improve manpower controls and increase productivity. This will be done by a continuing review of personnel needs, eliminating low-priority work, and adopting more efficient practices. A system of inspections and reviews will be carried on to measure the effectiveness and results of our efforts, and to help uncover new ways to economize.

As evidence of improved productivity and cost reduction in Government, I offer these examples:

In the Veterans' Administration's insurance program, 6 million insurance policies were handled in 1950 by over 17,000 employees; now the same number of policies is being handled by 3,000 employees.

In the Treasury Department, nearly three times as many checks and bonds are now being issued per employee as were issued 10 years ago and management improvements have made it possible to close and consolidate a number of field offices.

In the Farmers Home Administration, a 35-percent increase has been achieved in 2 years in the number of loans processed per employee.

In the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, output per worker will increase during the current year by 5.5 percent. Had this not been achieved, the agency would have required 1,700 more employees at a cost of about \$10 million. Further productivity gains are expected in the coming year.

In the Patent Office, a vigorous program to improve efficiency led to an increase in productivity of 13 percent in processing patent applications in fiscal year 1962 compared with the previous year.

Actions taken by the Department of Defense will produce savings of \$750 million this year alone in the cost of logistical operations. The Department's goal is to reduce these costs by at least \$3 billion annually within a 5-year period without affecting combat strength.

In the Corps of Engineers, improvements in organization completed in 1962 have eliminated 1,600 jobs and reduced annual costs by \$13 million.

Despite a steady rise in mail volume, the Post Office is hiring fewer new employees than in previous years, and more efficient practices are being instituted. Savings this fiscal year are expected to reach \$40 million.

Energetic management and employee cooperation in the Internal Revenue Service have brought a wide range of efficiency gains which translate into fiscal year 1963 savings of about \$4.2 million.

In the Bonneville Power Administration, new design standards for power transmission facilities will effect savings of \$7.5 million in costs of facilities started in 1963 and 1964.

In the Tennessee Valley Authority, a new system for handling coal at the Bull

Run plant will save about \$1 million in plant investment.

The Federal Aviation Agency, by consolidating traffic control centers, will save \$7 million over a period of years. In addition, the discontinuance of non-standard distance-measuring equipment will save \$1.4 million this year.

The Department of Agriculture expects to achieve an annual saving of \$1.3 million after consolidating payroll functions and effecting efficiencies in certain personnel and fiscal management areas.

In the Atomic Energy Commission, greater efficiency in producing special nuclear material will save \$7 million this year.

In the Veterans' Administration, conversion of insurance accounting and benefit payment operations to electronic computer equipment will reduce operating costs by \$1.7 million this year. A decision to buy rather than rent computers will lead to savings of \$1.6 million annually. The closing of some nonessential field offices will produce annual savings of \$1.2 million.

These are heartening examples of cost reduction. They are representative of the effort that is being made throughout the Federal Government, and they bring credit to the officials and employees who are responsible.

We will continue to give priority to the cost reduction program in all Federal operations.

Salary reform: As I requested, the Congress last year enacted major legislation in the field of pay administration. The Congress accepted the sound principle that I had strongly urged; namely, that Federal salaries should be determined by comparisons with rates paid by private employers for similar levels of work. The comparability principle for the first time provides a reasonable and objective formula for judging the adequacy of Government salary levels. Moreover, this single reform will go far toward enabling the Federal Government to secure and retain the high quality personnel it needs.

Significant elements of my proposals for pay adjustments have not yet been acted on, however. Salaries of upper level career personnel are still too low when measured by the compensation provided outside of Government. In addition, the pay rates scheduled to take effect on January 1, 1964, will need to be improved moderately to maintain comparability with pay in the private economy, in the light of data recently reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. I shall ask the Congress to take appropriate action on these matters at an early date.

Having taken a major step toward establishment of a proper system of compensation for career employees, we must wait no longer to initiate a review of the salaries of department and agency heads and their deputies. Existing salaries for these officials are inadequate by any reasonable standard of comparison. Taxpayers gain rather than lose when pay is adequate to attract and hold able people. When the Congress enacted the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, it requested that recommendations be submitted to the next session for appropriate increases

in Federal executive salaries at all levels. Accordingly, I intend to establish an advisory panel, made up of distinguished private citizens, to examine the present compensation for top positions in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, and to suggest appropriate adjustment in the pay for these positions. After the panel concludes its study, I will make recommendations to the Congress.

CONCLUSION

The budget and fiscal policies I am proposing will serve the most urgent needs of our people, promote efficient performance of Government functions, and help release the brake on the rate of growth of our economy.

Our practical choice is not between a deficit and a budgetary surplus. It is instead between two kinds of deficits: a chronic deficit of inertia due to inadequate economic growth—or a temporary deficit resulting from a tax and expenditure program designed to provide for our national security, boost the economy, increase tax revenue, and achieve future budget surpluses. The first type of deficit is a sign of waste and weakness. The second is an investment in the future.

It is of great importance for the years ahead that we act boldly now if we are to assure more jobs for an ever-growing labor force, if we are to achieve higher standards of living, and if we are to continue to provide the leadership required of us in the free world community. I am convinced that the program encompassed in this budget represents a proper use of fiscal tools for achieving these important goals.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

JANUARY 17, 1963.

STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, after careful study of the President's state of the Union message we are forced once again to the conclusion that President Kennedy lacks an understanding of, first, the basic economics of a private market society, second, the role of Federal Government in today's society, and third, human nature with its need for freedom and incentives.

Specifically, as to No. 1, economics, the President asked for a tax cut, but without reduced spending. He recognized that to keep the deficit manageable requires the reduction or postponement of many desirable projects and programs, and then contradicted this premise by outlining a number of new ones which will call for increased spending. In every field of human endeavor he called for renewed Federal participation and at the same time promised no greater expenditures next year than this. He reiterated the trite theme song of the New Frontier that the cold war and the need for increasing our defenses as the

reason for not being able to reduce spending to match the tax cut. Yet we all know that nondefense, welfare spending has soared to much greater heights than has defense spending under President Kennedy. None of the President's remarks in this area were consistent.

On No. 2, the role of the Federal Government, he identified every problem with the need for Federal action and planning. The fact is that to identify all human problems as areas for Federal Government aid and planning is basically unconstitutional and unwarranted intrusion into our lives and the economy of our country, stultifying rather than aiding economic growth. Yet the President has continued confidence that by throwing dollars at any problem will solve it.

As to No. 3, human nature and its need for freedom and incentives, the President simply does not recognize that freedom loving people will not work as hard for the Government and under Government planning and control as they will work for themselves.

In all his discussion of domestic policies, the President never once mentioned the most serious problem facing this Nation, one which poses the greatest threat to our freedoms and to economic growth, the unbridled power of monopolistic labor unions. At the very moment when two of our largest cities are without newspapers because of strikes, and when shipping along our entire east coast is paralyzed by the irresponsible action of a powerful union, the President chose to ignore the economic significance of such action. He failed to point out the record-breaking number of man-hours lost by strikes during the first 2 years of his administration. Such omission from a man who only a year ago pilloried the steel industry for exercising its right to a lawful increase in prices, makes us fearful of the extent to which he is willing to accord a few labor leaders preferential treatment at the expense of all other segments of our society.

At this point I would like to include a column by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, January 15, pointing out this omission and other inaccuracies in the President's message:

STRIKES AND THE STATE OF THE UNION—PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE IS CRITICIZED FOR NOT MENTIONING LABOR PROBLEM

(David Lawrence)

President Kennedy's annual message to Congress is inaccurately entitled "The State of the Union." For Mr. Kennedy omitted reference to some of the most important subjects confronting America today, particularly how the national economy shall be saved from disintegration due to the monopoly power being exercised by a bloc of labor unions. Millions of people in two major cities—New York and Cleveland—have had their newspapers suppressed. Financial losses to persons in business and to individuals out of work are heavy and are irreparable.

Nor did the President mention the strike that has tied up shipping for more than 3 weeks now in the ports of the East Coast and the Gulf of Mexico. Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, Republican leader, at least introduced a bill the same day to provide for compulsory arbitration of strikes in the maritime industry.

Not a single word appeared in the President's message, moreover, concerning the

plight of the rank and file of American workers who are the victims of a lack of intelligent leadership.

The President has failed to come to grips with what has really been ailing America the last decade or more—the power of a single group to force prices upward, and the inability of the country immediately to absorb such price increases.

Basic economic ailments will not be cured by indifference. Mr. Kennedy in his message talked fluently about the economic development of the countries of Europe and of the problems faced by the underdeveloped countries. He spoke in generalities about social-welfare legislation in this country, but didn't make specific recommendations on many of the worthwhile objectives he mentioned.

The President seemed to think that, by giving his support to a project for the reduction of taxes, he would be winning applause in the country. To promise a tax cut and to achieve one are, however, two different things. The voters will get little comfort out of a tax cut if economic uncertainty prevails and if Government spending continues as indicated, with the prospect of a record-breaking deficit in the U.S. Treasury next year.

Oddly enough, Mr. Kennedy seemed preoccupied with the idea that the Nation at present may not be taking its problems seriously. He said: "In short, both at home and abroad, there may now be a temptation to relax." One wonders whether the country is, after all, really in a relaxed mood and is indifferent to the dangers both at home and abroad.

As for the young people out of work, Mr. Kennedy seems to be despairing of ways to find productive jobs for them. He appears to be reverting to one of the ideas of New Deal days, when the Civilian Conservation Corps was organized to take care of many of the younger persons who were unemployed. The President thinks that the Peace Corps can do something of the same job. He spoke of the million young Americans who are out of school and out of work and suggests that a domestic Peace Corps of some kind would serve "our own community needs: in mental hospitals, on Indian reservations, in centers for the aged or for young delinquents, in schools for the illiterate or the handicapped." He said all this might enable these young men to serve the cause of "domestic tranquility."

The President had a heading on one section of his message which read: "We need to strengthen our Nation by making the best and most economical use of its resources and facilities." But he did not really delve into this highly controversial field beyond stating that new transportation facilities are needed and that the stockpile of goods, including farm products, must be reduced. In that phrase, "most economical use" of American resources and facilities, is rooted the present-day difficulties of the whole economic system.

The President did include in his address one sentence referring with disapproval to the "growing pressures" by labor leaders for a 35-hour week. But the reason for the omission of any reference to labor-management difficulties throughout the country is not apparent unless it be that the subject is a highly controversial one and could cost the President votes in 1964.

The labor unions themselves are the biggest single organized group of voters in the country today and contributed not only energy but money to help the President win his election in 1960. Mr. Kennedy not long ago attacked businessmen for trying to raise their prices. Yet he has never taken a positive stand with reference to the extreme demands of labor union leaders evidenced, for instance, in the big strikes in New York City and other parts of the country.

As long as one economic group can control the American system by fixing costs of production, which inevitably affect prices, there will not be a free-market system in the United States, and the law of supply and demand will not operate effectively to bring prosperity. The Government will find itself compelled to intervene as between labor and management if it really wants to stop recessions. But such intervention will compound the evils of the present-day system unless it is impartial, objective, and fair as between the rival forces.

Mr. Speaker, as to the portions of the message on foreign policy, I heartily disagree with the President. I, for one, am not proud of a foreign policy that has cost the lives of American boys in Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, and in other parts of the world. Our foreign policy, or lack of foreign policy, is a shame and a disgrace and an affront to freedom-loving peoples everywhere. I believe in reimposing the Monroe Doctrine as the only way to end the threat of Communist aggression from Cuba. I cannot agree with President Kennedy that the Cuban threat is removed. Without inspection we have no proof that the missiles were ever actually removed. Certainly we know that there are still thousands of Russian soldiers in Cuba. Now we are told that Russia is building new rocket sites there and at the Communist Party conference now in session in East Berlin, Cuba has been reassured of Soviet support. Wherein, Mr. President, has the Cuban threat been removed? I disagree with the President's policy of interdependence and economic partnership. I am for U.S. sovereignty and believe our best course lies in friendly rivalry and competition.

I am not proud, as the President is, of the role of the United Nations or of our part in its policies which are contrary to fundamental American principles of freedom. I believe in self-determination for the people, not domination by the U.N., Communist Russia or any other nationalistic or world government. I believe in the complete independence of the United States, not in its domination and control by the U.N. or by other nations through the U.N. Only the strength and freedom of the United States keeps the U.N. afloat, and yet the Communist-dominated and so-called neutral domination of the U.N. is weakening the United States. While we support it and keep it alive we are outvoted by nations in sympathy with the Communists and helplessly watch the Russians outwit us by subterfuge and subversion.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues and the American people to take a second, hard look at the President's message. I am fearful the state of the Union is not as good as he seems to think it is.

To conclude this analysis of the state of the Union message I would like to call attention to the following editorials from the Chicago Daily Tribune and the Wall Street Journal:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Jan. 15, 1963]

THE ECONOMICS OF ILLUSION

Mr. Kennedy's economic proposals in yesterday's message on the state of the Union are straight out of the dream book. He wants to cut taxes on personal and corporation income by a net of \$10 billion dur-

ing the next 3 years. The cut would total \$13.5 billion, but he hopes Congress would tighten up the tax laws so that \$3.5 billion of this amount would return to the Treasury.

This reduction would be achieved, he says, within the limits of a manageable budgetary deficit. The cut would temporarily increase the deficit, but Mr. Kennedy thinks that the cut could ultimately end the deficit.

The question that arises at once is what Mr. Kennedy considers a manageable deficit. In his first 2 years in office the accumulated deficit has been \$14.1 billion. With a reduction in revenue, the annual rate of the deficit is certain to rise sharply in the year ahead.

Even in the absence of a tax cut, Mr. Kennedy assures this result. He concedes as much in admitting that interest on the debt, which already takes 10 cents of every tax dollar, will rise in the coming year.

But this is only one of several major fields of spending where the Kennedy budget envisions bigger expenses. More is to be spent on defense and more is to be spent on space in order to land that man on the moon.

With these exceptions—and we won't know how large the increases are to be until Mr. Kennedy submits his budget—the President promises to hold total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level.

That is no particular consolation, for the budget for the present year is a record peace time \$93.7 billion—up \$13 billion from the last budget submitted by President Eisenhower.

Yet Mr. Kennedy offers an assortment of other spending schemes which belie the possibility that expenditures other than those for defense, space, and debt service can be held below this year's level. There is to be no abatement of foreign aid. There are proposals for conserving or retraining youth. There is to be a domestic peace corps. Large investments are to go to health, hospitals, and training doctors and dentists. The mentally ill are to be brought under the Federal wing.

Nor is this all. Urban mass transit subsidies are on the list. The Government is to provide legal counsel to the needy. National parks and recreation areas are to be expanded. It is to be assumed that this involves converting farmland into recreation preserves. There are to be more water development projects.

Perhaps the state of the Union is as good as Mr. Kennedy says it is, but is it so good that the Government can continue an endless spending binge at the same time it forgoes revenue to pay for its schemes? And is Mr. Kennedy justified in believing that inflation is a thing of the past, something that need cause us no future worry?

If all this is fiscal responsibility, as the President says it is, then John Law and the fiat money inflationists of revolutionary France may retroactively be proved sound economists.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 16, 1963]

CUSTODIAN OF QUALITY

It's too bad President Kennedy didn't end his state of the Union speech about a third of the way through—when he was way ahead with his attractive tax-cut proposals. Instead, he apparently thought it necessary to tack on, along with a superficial look at foreign affairs, a motley assortment of recommendations adding up to a domestic program.

We suppose a President these days feels he must offer a spending program of some kind; otherwise the voters might figure he wasn't doing his job. That is an unfortunate attitude, and particularly when Mr. Kennedy himself says the Government must hold back on desirable projects in view of still higher spending and the prospect of

lower taxes. To then propose a bunch of expensive new projects simply makes nonsense of that promise.

And the recommendations are not only stated in clichés; their underlying concepts are shopworn and not always valid. "The quality of American life," the President declares, "must keep pace with the quantity of American goods." Fair enough, but by what magic is the Federal Government able to improve the quality of life merely by spending money?

Translated into some specifics, the Kennedy approach means the Government must, for one thing, invest in our youth. It must bring education to more youngsters—which puts the emphasis on quantity rather than quality. It must do something about the 1 million young Americans who are both out of school and out of work.

These unemployed youths unquestionably represent a problem, but we fear Mr. Kennedy is less than accurate when he says there is no reason for their plight. There are abundant reasons: The effects of the long permissive trend in the home and school, a lack of sufficient ambition, and achievement potential in individuals, Government subsidies which make not working attractive to some people, discrimination against youngsters by some labor unions.

Only by studying such underlying causes can there be much hope of dealing with this and other problems. Simply to plop a new Government program on top of the problem is not to solve it but to gloss it.

In a similar vein, Mr. Kennedy calls for a domestic peace corps of young men and women to work with young delinquents and other troubled people. Juvenile delinquency is obviously a local problem whose causes are analogous to those of the unemployed youth problem. But anyway, the President is in effect saying the Nation should have more social workers. If so, why not say so, instead of wrapping it up in language suggesting that the proposal is a brilliant new inspiration?

The list could go on. Mr. Kennedy wants the Federal Government to jump into local mass transit with large-scale assistance. We would agree that some of the cities have not been especially ingenious about their traffic troubles—like building more and more multi-lane urban expressways to feed into narrower New York City streets and compound the congestion. But if the city fathers can't deal with their own traffic, it's a cinch a remote officialdom can't do it for them.

There is indeed a way Washington could help improve the quality of American life; not only by reducing the oppressive tax rates but by reducing the whole burden of a Government whose cost and controls and interventions impinge on everybody's life. Our history shows that people, as individuals, families, and communities, will do their own improving when they get the chance.

But no doubt that is far too radical a thought for those who espouse the reactionary philosophy that Government must be the sole creator and custodian of quality.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 15, 1963]

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE LEDGER

Please excuse us for beginning with a statement so obvious it shouldn't have to be made: To make sense of Government finances, or any other, it is necessary to look at both the income and outgo sides of the ledger. Yet this simple fact seems at best imperfectly understood in Washington.

On one side President Kennedy is moving with vigor and dispatch. Having correctly concluded that the tax burden is holding back the economy, he calls for a huge reduction of the burden. Though yesterday's state of the Union address provides only the broad outlines, the President's \$13.5 billion tax-cut package certainly looks appealing.

Unlike the tax thinking long embraced by modern economists, the Kennedy approach recognizes that useful tax reduction must unloose investment potential; therefore it must entail significant reductions in rates, corporate as well as individual, at the top as well as the bottom. So he proposes replacing the present 20 to 91 percent range for individuals with a 14 to 65 percent range, and lowering the top corporate rate from 52 to 47 percent.

The President further realizes that in an economy of this tremendous size, effective tax cuts have got to be big ones. "We cannot afford to be timid or slow. For this is the most urgent task confronting the Congress in 1963."

Politically also this package looks well wrapped, even though it will be thoroughly pulled apart before anything comes out of it, if anything ever does. While it is investment oriented, it does not neglect all us voters in the lower brackets; in fact, that's where the biggest reduction goes.

In addition, it appears that some of the reductions could come before any so-called reforms—the kind of legislation that can produce practically endless wrangles in Congress. And by splitting the package into three annual parts, the President should succeed in softening some of the opposition from those who fear the budgetary impact of tax reduction.

All in all, then, this is a tax philosophy that in general everyone can applaud, out of national as well as personal interest. That is, so long as anyone looks at only that side of the ledger.

Here again we must inflict a statement of the painfully obvious: The Nation is burdened with these towering, growth-inhibiting taxes for one reason only, and that is the towering and ever-rising spending of the Federal Government. The spending is so great, indeed, that even these fierce levies almost never supply enough revenue.

Yet what does the President have to say about that side of the books? Well, we know this fiscal year will show a deficit of around \$8 billion or more, and that the forthcoming 1964 period will show another deficit of large dimensions.

In that fiscal framework Mr. Kennedy promises to hold expenditures for fiscal 1964 below this year's—except for defense, space, and fixed-interest charges. Whatever the need for those rises, they plainly spell a bigger total spending budget. The hope of holding down in other areas is apparently pinned largely on administrative economies, which always sounds good but never seems to amount to much.

In practically the same breath, moreover, the President proposes a whole slew of new Government projects including aid to education, help for unemployed youths, an expanded health program, aid to local mass transit, and a domestic peace corps.

Whatever may be said of the desirability of any of these, they are spending programs, and some of them would be far from cheap. How this prospect, on top of all the existing high-cost programs, ties in with lower expenditures and eventual budget balance is a bit mysterious.

One clue to the mystery, to be sure, is the administration's belief that its large-scale tax cuts would generate so much economic activity that its revenues would increase even with the lower rates. That is a possibility; it may even be a probability. But it is not a certainty. All that is now certain is higher spending and deficits.

For that reason we can't agree with Mr. Kennedy when he says that his tax package, viewed in its deficit-spending setting, is "a fiscally responsible program—the surest and soundest way of achieving in time a balanced budget in a balanced full-employment economy."

Tax cutting is not at all the surest and soundest way to a balanced budget; that way is to reduce the spending. The Kennedy tax program may be fine by itself, but the Government's financial policy as a whole cannot honestly be called responsible.

The saddest part is that there is every reason to believe this Nation's economy could really go places. It could, that is, if the President would only give the same serious attention to the spending side of the ledger that he is giving to the problems of our obsolete tax structure.

FINAL REPORT OF HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the 87th Congress, the Select Committee on Small Business conducted extensive studies, investigations, and analyses of the problems confronting the small business sector. On July 23, August 20, and October 16, 1962, interim reports on certain specific problems were made by the Committee to the membership of the House. A complete summary of the results of these 2 years of work is contained in the final report of the Select Committee on Small Business submitted to the House of Representatives during the closing days of the 87th Congress. It will be available in printed form within a few days.

This report discloses that the problems faced by the small business sector of our national economy continue to increase in number, scope, and intensity. This situation arises from such factors as:

Increasing industrial and economic concentration, which is being worsened by mergers together with the failure of the appropriate agencies to adequately cope with the problems raised by conglomerate mergers.

The increasing difficulty of obtaining adequate financing from conventional sources for the expansion and modernization which is essential to the survival of small businesses.

The technological revolution which has brought about increasing reliance upon weapon systems in national defense and the concomitant increase in multimillion dollar prime contract awards to large concerns for the production of these systems.

The expected sharp increase in America's participation in international trade, which will produce both challenges and opportunities for small business. There is little question that during the early, transitional stages, increased competition from imported goods will cause severe economic pressures upon many smaller concerns.

The problems faced by small business which result from population shifts, urban renewal, and neighborhood blight in urban centers.

The pressures imposed upon small businesses by persistent economic distress in areas suffering from depletion of

natural resources, migration of farm population, and similar causes.

Discriminatory practices by larger concerns, particularly the increase in violations of the Robinson-Patman Act and other statutes designed to protect the public interest and the small business community.

There is not a congressional district in this country which does not have hundreds—thousands would be more typical—of small businesses which presently or potentially face serious distress from these and related causes. Small business problems are of both great importance and grave concern to the entire Congress. The Select Committee on Small Business, in recognition of this concern, has produced a number of publications designed to assist both the Members and their constituents in this regard. It is hoped that these publications will prove helpful. They are the culmination of 2 years of work. Cumulatively, the reports present a comprehensive analysis of problems currently encountered by individual small businesses.

FINAL REPORT

This report consists of 125 pages, together with minority views. It is a survey of the work of the committee and deals with the full spectrum of problems currently being encountered by America's small businesses. It contains 37 specific recommendations designed to assist small business.

ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

This 60-page report by Subcommittee No. 1, under the chairmanship of the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, analyzes the operation of the Small Business Administration. Some emphasis is laid upon small business investment companies and the activities of the agency designed to strengthen small business management practices.

SMALL BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

This 14-page report by Subcommittee No. 2, under the chairmanship of the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, analyzes present Federal procurement practices and shows the necessity for obtaining a more equitable share of Government procurement for the small business sector.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SMALL BUSINESS IN FOREIGN TRADE

This 22-page report by Subcommittee No. 3, under the chairmanship of the Honorable SIDNEY R. YATES, is a survey of the probable impact of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 upon the small business sector. It includes a detailed analysis of the Trade Expansion Act.

SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS CREATED BY PETROLEUM IMPORTS

This 36-page report by Subcommittee No. 4, under the chairmanship of the Honorable TOM STEED, analyzes problems of independent petroleum and coal producers resulting from the import of petroleum products. A detailed analysis of the regulations of the Oil Import Administration and the recent executive

order pertaining to oil imports is included. Additionally, there are 3 volumes of hearings comprising 1,556 pages in which this subject is exhaustively explored.

OPERATION AND EFFECT OF CONSENT DECREE IN WEST COAST OIL CASE

This 45-page report by Subcommittee No. 5, under the chairmanship of the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, studies the effect upon the petroleum industry of the consent decree entered in 1959 in the West Coast Oil case. Findings are made regarding the extent to which the industry is complying with the provisions of the decree, and certain recommendations are made for amendment of the decree. The hearing on which the report is based has been published and is also available.

FINANCING PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

This 28-page report, also by Subcommittee No. 5, is based on questionnaires sent to trade associations in a number of industries. It shows the current lack of availability to the small business sector of adequate financing from conventional sources. Some emphasis is placed on the retail portion of the petroleum industry.

ADVERTISING OPPORTUNITIES FOR SMALL BUSINESS IN RADIO AND TELEVISION

This 62-page report by Subcommittee No. 6, under the chairmanship of the Honorable DALE ALFORD shows the detrimental effect upon the small business sector of the lack of equal access to prime television time for use in advertising its goods and services. Numerous recommendations are made, based upon hearings held by the subcommittee. The hearings consist of 260 pages in their published form.

SMALL BUSINESS IN THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

This 34-page report by a special subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable TOM STEED, sets forth the findings of a number of field investigations made by the subcommittee, together with other recent developments in the dairy industry. The report shows the prevalence of unfair practices and increasing concentration in the dairy industry.

SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

This 24-page report by a special subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable TOM STEED, is a study of current problems of independent poultry growers. It makes a number of specific recommendations aimed at correcting existing unfair practices in the distribution of poultry. Also available are the hearings upon which the report was based, consisting of three volumes, totaling 375 pages.

SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE TOMATO INDUSTRY

This 11-page report by a special subcommittee, together with minority views, under the chairmanship of the Honorable TOM STEED, explores some of the problems suffered by the tomato industry. It makes specific recommendations for the elimination of certain unfair practices operating to the detri-

ment of the small business sector of the industry. Also available is the 196-page volume of hearings on this subject.

FEDERAL HANDBOOK FOR SMALL BUSINESS

This 101-page handbook was published in conjunction with the Select Committee on Small Business of the U.S. Senate, the White House Committee on Small Business, and the Small Business Administration. It provides a long-needed and extremely valuable source of information for the small businessman, in that it sets forth briefly and concisely the various services available to small businessmen from the several departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

FOREIGN TRADE—NEW FRONTIER FOR SMALL BUSINESS

This staff report sets forth in brief form various services and sources of information available from both government and private sources to the small businessman planning to enter foreign trade. It also shows how foreign markets can be of great value to a small business.

MERGERS AND SUPERCONCENTRATION

The 272-page staff report studies the latest trends in mergers in the American economy. Analysis is made of the impact of this merger movement on the small business sector.

CHAIN BANKING: STOCKHOLDER AND LOAN LINKS OF 200 LARGEST MEMBER BANKS

This 520 page report of the chairman to the Small Business Committee is a study of certain current practices leading to increased concentration within the banking structure of the Nation. Analysis is made of the impact it has had upon the small business community.

TAX EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND CHARITABLE TRUSTS: THEIR IMPACT ON OUR ECONOMY

This 135-page interim report of the chairman to the Small Business Committee is a study of the findings to date regarding the impact of tax exempt foundations and charitable trusts on our economy—dealing, in particular, with foundation-controlled enterprises in competition with taxpaying businessmen. The report proposes a number of reforms with regard to the law governing these tax exempt organizations.

The small businessmen of America today face increasing problems and pressures, a situation which requires both full consideration and vigorous action by the 88th Congress. During the next 2 years the question of economic survival will be decided for a sizable portion of the small business sector of this country. It is imperative that we bend our greatest efforts toward assisting, preserving, and strengthening this vital segment of our national economy.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874 REQUESTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Public Laws 815 and 874 were enacted in 1950 to assist local school districts overburdened by military installations and other Federal activities that were thrust upon them in our great programs of national preparedness. These laws have been of very great assistance to schools in my congressional district as I have personally observed, to the State of Texas, and to the entire Nation. They have assisted hard-pressed school districts faced with the problem of greatly increased enrollment connected with nontaxable Federal property where schoolchildren lived or where their parents were employed. This legislation has been a direct and important aid to the various Federal projects essential to the defense and domestic development of the Nation.

Because it was anticipated that a general aid to education bill would be passed in the 87th Congress to help all school districts, Public Laws 874 and 815 were allowed to expire on June 30, 1961, and were extended for 2 years only at the very last moment. They will expire again on June 30, 1963.

In my congressional district, 33 school districts received Federal assistance in 1960 and 1961 for maintenance and operation, in the amount of over \$835,000. This aid was vital particularly where school resources were at the point of exhaustion.

In the 1962 fiscal year, 245 different school districts in the State of Texas provided free public education for approximately 132,000 federally connected children. More than 16,000 of these children lived on military bases and other Federal properties. These 245 school districts received a total of just under \$14 million to assist them in providing a high-quality education for the children of workers at defense installations and other Federal projects. Also during this same fiscal year a little over \$2 million was allocated to 11 school districts in Texas for the construction of urgently needed school facilities to house the increased enrollment. Since 1950 when Public Law 815 was enacted, just under \$60 million has been allocated to school districts in the State of Texas for the same purpose. Without the Federal funds authorized by this program, some 1,800 school districts in my own State and in other States would have faced grave problems in providing facilities for the increasing school population connected with defense and other Federal activities.

Parents who are the workers in our great defense effort must know that their children are being provided for in our school systems. Our school districts must have foreknowledge that funds will be provided.

The temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 authorizing assistance for children of parents employed on Federal property, which expire at the end of this fiscal year, provide from 70 to 85 percent of the total assistance granted each year under the Federal impact legislation. These expiring provisions must be extended if the school districts are to continue to provide necessary school facilities and school services to

federally connected children as well as to the other children in their districts. This action must be taken promptly so that school administrators may know what to count on in planning their budgets for expenditures after June of 1963; without the assurance of Federal aid, they cannot make firm preparations for the coming school year. I feel that a program which has been so well received by the local educational agencies, by the State Departments of Education, and by educational organizations and other informed professional groups throughout the entire Nation; that has been administered efficiently and without objectionable Federal controls from Washington; and one that has been a boon to hard-pressed school districts in every State of the Nation, should certainly be extended for a period of 2 years.

Surely the education of our children is one of the most important considerations before this Congress. Viewed also as a major factor affecting worker efficiency in our defense establishment, there is no question of our legislative responsibility to extend the provisions of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 which will otherwise expire on June 30, 1963.

COIN SHORTAGE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is in the midst of an acute coin shortage; so much so that in one instance during the recent holiday season, with its attendant high demand for coins, a midwestern concern seriously considered the issuance of scrip. The fact is that all of the present mint facilities working round the clock—24 hours per day, 7 days per week at top speed, could produce 4,100 million coins annually. Even this effort would be short of the present estimated annual demand for coins by 900 million. The actual present situation is far worse because the mint does not have sufficient appropriated funds to support overtime work, and only 3,370 million coins can be produced annually, leaving an annual shortage of over 1½ billion coins. We need an annual production of at least 5 billion coins of all denominations. The Bureau of the Mint has received confirmation of the seriousness of the problem from a firm of independent experts whose objective finding is that mint facilities must be increased. This is really good news when we consider that this hunger for coinage is created by our own population explosion and our strong and ever-advancing economy.

WILLARD B. SIMMONS NAMED MAN OF THE YEAR BY DRUG INDUSTRY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks

at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the best known citizens of the First Congressional District of Texas has recently received a signal honor. Willard B. Simmons, of Texarkana, executive secretary of the National Association of Retail Druggists, has been named 1962 Man of the Year in the drug field of the United States by the American Druggist magazine.

Texarkana and the entire First District are proud of the contributions that Willard B. Simmons has made to this extremely important segment of the American economy and the recognition that he has received for his outstanding efforts.

The following is an article from the NARD Journal describing some of Mr. Simmons' many activities and accomplishments in this field.

SIMMONS OF THE NARD NAMED 1962 MAN OF THE YEAR IN THE DRUG INDUSTRY OF AMERICA

Willard B. Simmons, executive secretary of the NARD, has been named 1962 Man of the Year in the drug field of the United States. The award, which is presented by the American Druggist magazine, is a means of annually recognizing the individual who makes the greatest contribution to the welfare of the drug industry.

Simmons thus becomes the ninth person and the second executive head of the NARD to win the American Druggist award. The late John W. Dargavel, Simmons' predecessor, received the honor in 1954, the year the award was established. The honor was also won by the late George Frates, who was Washington representative of the NARD.

Simmons was one of 27 persons considered for the honor, and so overwhelming was the consensus of the nominating panel that his selection marked the first time in the 9-year history of the award that the winner was chosen on the first ballot.

The nationwide panel of voters who gave Simmons this accolade consisted of presidents and secretaries of all state, local and national organizations in the drug industry, and of all state boards of pharmacy, deans of all accredited pharmacy colleges and editors of all national, sectional and state drug publications.

In choosing Simmons, the pharmacy leaders took note of the fact that in his first year as NARD executive secretary, he responded in a forthright and statesmanlike manner to vital challenges confronting the entire drug industry.

The following achievements brought about the selection of Simmons as the 1962 Man of the Year:

1. He took the lead to bring about effective united action in support of Federal legislation in behalf of independent enterprise and the profession of pharmacy.
2. He made decisive contributions to teamwork among the different segments in the production and distribution of medication and in the profession of pharmacy.
3. He provided leadership in antitrust problems and also in connection with the menace of monopoly in the retail field.
4. He multiplied the interest of business people (both in and outside the drug field) in the dangers of too much power centered in the Federal Government (he warned in speeches and articles that the drift toward autocratic Federal authority must be stopped to safeguard freedom).

5. He took an active and major part in the campaigns directed in opposition to socialized medicine, which activity helped to prevent the enactment of the medicare bills in the 87th Congress.

TWO DIFFERENT FAIR TRADE BILLS

The major problem confronting the independent retail pharmacists when Simmons assumed leadership of the NARD, was the fact that the chances of achieving badly needed Federal fair trade legislation were stymied by the existence of two separate legislative approaches embodied in two different bills and backed by two different groups which seemed to be more at odds than in agreement with each other.

On one hand, there was the NARD, serving as the spearhead of one group, sponsoring a bill introduced by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and other legislators.

On the other hand, there was Quality Brands Associates, leading another group and sponsoring a competitive measure introduced by Senator Homer Capehart.

So long as these two groups fought for congressional attention, there was little likelihood of ever winning enactment of Federal legislation to protect small retailers from predatory price cutters.

This was the situation that confronted Simmons when the executive committee of the NARD asked him in 1961 to resign as chairman of that committee and to give up active direction of his Texas drug business in order to take over as fulltime executive head of the association.

Recognizing that the fair trade situation was his No. 1 responsibility as NARD executive secretary, Simmons moved with skill and dispatch to break the deadlock that prevented action.

His statesmanship and persuasiveness resulted in an agreement by all those concerned to back a single quality stabilization bill. In the Senate, the bill was sponsored jointly by Senators HUMPHREY and Capehart and by others who, in previous years, had had to choose one of two rival measures if they wanted to be known as fair trade supporters.

Similarly, in the House of Representatives, a single bill got the joint sponsorship of Representatives OREN HARRIS and RAYMOND MADDEN, who formerly had supported competing bills.

Thus, the 1962 sessions of Congress had only one fair trade bill to consider, and the appropriate committees of the two Houses could concentrate their attention on one bill instead of two.

ENGINEERED A UNITED FRONT

Moreover, as a result of the united front engineered by Simmons, the members of these committees were made well aware that more than 70 organizations in the retail, wholesale and manufacturing fields were united in demanding that legislation be enacted to save thousands of small retailers from bankruptcy that threatened them through no fault of their own.

Many of those who cast Man of the Year ballots for Simmons mentioned also the vigor and drive with which he crossed the country time and again during 1962 to convince druggists that their own personal efforts—via letters, telegrams, phone calls and personal visits—were essential in winning congressional support for the quality stabilization bill.

His efforts in this connection are considered largely responsible for the bill's having won favorable action this year in the Interstate Commerce Subcommittees of both Houses of Congress. In light of this accomplishment, many observers feel that the bill now has sufficient congressional backing for passage this year. Simmons has promised that the drive for legislation to make predatory price cutting illegal will be

pursued with great vigor in this session of Congress.

The Man of the Year Award, a mortar and pestle mounted on a pedestal, will be presented to Simmons at a place and date of his choosing.

AMERICAN LEGION MIDWINTER CONFERENCE

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 12, 1963, at Tuscaloosa, Ala., I had the privilege of addressing the midwinter conference of the Alabama department of the American Legion. The text of my statement follows:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE ARMISTEAD SELDEN, AMERICAN LEGION MID-WINTER CONFERENCE, TUSCALOOSA, ALA., JANUARY 12, 1963

This month marks the fourth anniversary of the establishment of the Castro regime in Cuba. The years since January 1959, when Fidel Castro assumed power in Havana, have been years of sustained crisis and peril for freedom-loving Cubans and for the entire hemisphere.

Now, in January 1963, let no American doubt that the crisis will continue and the peril remain until the red stain of Castro communism is forever removed from the Caribbean.

It is well that we keep this fundamental policy fact in mind at this juncture in world affairs. For since the United States-Soviet missile showdown of last autumn, some voices have been raised which argue that the Castro threat has been diminished—that like his Soviet missiles, Fidel Castro's explosive potential in the hemisphere has been defused.

The voices are familiar. By and large, they are the same voices which told us, before last autumn, that our best policy regarding Castro would be to do nothing at all. They are the same voices which put forth the comforting and dangerous notion that, left alone, Castro's regime would simply fall of its own weight. They are the same voices which scoffed at the suggestion that Castro and his Soviet mentors intended to convert Cuba into a Communist military and missile base in the Western Hemisphere.

In fact, looking back 4 years, they are the same voices which nurtured the shortsighted policy that brought Fidel Castro to power in the first place.

The events of last October and November, however grim, apparently have taught these advocates of a do-nothing and wait-and-see policy very little. Soviet missiles had hardly been dismantled in Cuba—if indeed we can really believe that the Soviet missile threat has been completely removed from that island—before these hawks of complacency were back at the same old stand, vending their familiar policy line.

Fortunately, they are finding very few buyers among the American people today. For the events of last autumn reaffirmed a basic principle of successful American policy. To paraphrase a great American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, that principle is: There is no substitute for action.

Action—and only action—saved our Nation, our hemisphere, and the free world from the imminent Soviet threat of last autumn. Before the President's decisive action of October 22, Castro and his Soviet

masters ignored our words and disdained our solemn warnings. They had come to believe, like their Chinese Communist allies, that the United States was no more than a "paper tiger."

On October 22, and in the critical days following, they learned better. Khrushchev learned an overdue lesson concerning American will and capabilities. Castro learned a bitter lesson concerning our determination—and the value of Soviet promises. The larger question remains: What did our own policymakers learn during those critical days?

Only the future can finally determine that answer. But a study of the record of recent years should provide some guidelines as to what American policymakers should have learned about dealing with Castro.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have been in close touch with the problem of Castro's Communist threat to the hemisphere since its inception. Let no one believe that the growth of this threat can be attributed to any one cause or any single political source. This is no partisan matter, and the foreign policy errors which led to the crisis of last October spanned two administrations.

In January 1960, during the Eisenhower administration, I stated that there was no hope for democracy in Cuba under the Castro regime. I urged that our policymakers develop a firmer, stronger U.S. stand against Castro.

Two months later, in March 1960, I called attention to the growing campaign of anti-U.S. propaganda emanating from Castro's Cuba, and asked for immediate action to counter this propaganda.

With the further deterioration of United States-Cuban relations, in June 1960, I called a special meeting of the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee to determine the extent of the threat of communism and of Castro's Cuba to the hemisphere. I stated at that time: "This country can ill afford to ignore mounting evidence that the present Cuban Government is being used to further the international Communist conspiracy."

Two months later, in August 1960, I publicly criticized the inconclusive results of the Inter-American Conference at San Jose, Costa Rica. U.S. delegates at that conference were unable to persuade the other American countries even to adopt a resolution which singled out Castro's Cuba by name.

In March 1961, 2 months after the inauguration of President Kennedy, I urged our Government to put an end to trade with Cuba.

One month later, in April 1961, I introduced a resolution calling for the impositions of sanctions against Cuba and the immediate exclusion of Castro's representatives from the Inter-American Defense Board. The House of Representatives overwhelmingly approved this resolution.

In June 1961 I warned that unless collective action against Castro were taken, the American people would demand a solution supported by those Latin American governments willing to honor their hemispheric commitments.

In October 1961 I pointed out that if the Organization of American States did not act soon against Castro, its usefulness would be undermined and the United States would be forced to take a new look at its OAS commitments.

One year ago, in January 1962, I was a member of the congressional group which accompanied the U.S. delegation to the historic Inter-American Foreign Ministers meeting at Punta del Este, Uruguay. It was at this meeting that the principle of collective action by the inter-American states was reaffirmed. The act of Punta del Este expelled Cuba from the inter-American system. It excluded Castro's representatives from the

Inter-American Defense Board. And it called for strict economic sanctions against the Cuban regime.

In reporting back to the Congress on the results of that meeting, I said: "At Punta del Este we took a step, a large step, but this step is merely the beginning of the end for communism in Cuba. Fidel Castro still controls Cuba, and international communism remains today a menace to our hemisphere."

All of this is by way of pointing out that there are those of us in Washington who have been and are alert to the continuing threat of Castro to our Nation and the hemisphere. To be sure, mine was not the only voice raised in warning, but, needless to say, there was complacency among some.

In looking back over this past record, we can wonder what different result might have been reached had our warnings been heeded. The sum and substance of all these warnings was to draw a clear and firm line against Communist encroachment in the hemisphere. Our Government's failure to draw this clear line inevitably led to Khrushchev's miscalculations of last October.

Khrushchev's missile gamble failed because finally we drew the line and took action to maintain it. But in the aftermath of this crisis, our greatest danger lies in the possibility of reverting to the blurred policies of the past. Since his strategic retreat of last autumn, Khrushchev has given every indication that he will, if we allow him, revert to his old gambling ways. We cannot afford further miscalculations on his part, at the risk of thermonuclear war. Our only chance to maintain the peace lies in making absolutely clear that our stand of October and November 1962 has not been relaxed.

My own feelings about the present Cuban situation can best be summed up by repeating what I told Congress last year, following the Punta del Este meetings. Let me again quote: "Fidel Castro still controls Cuba, and international communism remains today a menace to our hemisphere."

That is the paramount truth of the current Cuban situation, and we must not permit our attention to be diverted from this truth. Fidel Castro still controls Cuba. International communism remains today a menace to our hemisphere. Regardless of corollary issues and principles involved in our Cuban policy, we can never forget that this Nation is committed—irrevocably committed—to the liberation of Cuba and the elimination of the Castro regime from that island.

This commitment is fundamental. It is based not only on our international legal and moral obligations to the hemisphere and the free world, but on the necessities of our national security. This is a commitment that no American President or Secretary of State can bargain away, for our vital security interests are not negotiable.

It is well to keep this fundamental in mind when considering whether or not the United States, in its dealings last autumn with the Soviet Union, provided any guarantees against invasion of Castro's Cuba. Moreover, even if for the purposes of argument we grant that such a pledge could be given, the events of recent weeks would certainly negate the force of such an obligation.

The fact is that one of the vital conditions of President Kennedy's position of last October—the requirement for onsite inspection of Cuban missile bases—has not been met. There are also reports, from reliable and well-informed sources, that between 15,000 and 20,000 Soviet combat troops are still in Cuba. Their presence, only 90 miles from our shores and in the heart of the Americas, is intolerable. The removal of these Soviet forces is an urgent necessity if

our national and hemispheric security is to be safeguarded.

The primary U.S. foreign policy goal today is to make certain that the Kremlin understands that we have not deviated from our firmness of last autumn. There are several steps we can take, short of military action, to insure Khrushchev's understanding of our resolve to rid our hemisphere of the Castro Communist blight.

In October 1962, 2 weeks before President Kennedy acted against the Soviet Cuban missile threat, I proposed that our Government stop discouraging freedom-loving Cubans in their efforts to combat the Castro regime. At that time, I pointed out that, although this country does have a neutrality act, there can be no justification for the United States hampering efforts to liberate the suffering people of Cuba.

I reiterate what I proposed at that time, for my proposal is more than ever valid under present circumstances. The time is overdue for the United States to support and recognize a government of free Cuba. The Cuban missile crisis revealed to all the world that the Castro government is in fact not representative of the Cuban people, but a mere puppet and instrument of Soviet policy.

Whatever the administrative difficulties involved, let us now move to recognize a Cuban government-in-exile. Then let us make clear our intention and purpose to aid, support, and equip such a government in its own struggle against Communist tyranny in its homeland.

Yet another decisive step we can take to tighten hemispheric pressure against the Castro regime is the extension of sanctions against Communist Cuba to everything but food and medicine for the suffering Cuban people. In this regard, I am seriously concerned that approximately \$1.2 million from the United Nations Special Fund is scheduled to go to Castro's government for the construction of an agricultural experimental station. This U.N. expenditure will serve to bolster the sagging Communist agricultural economy of Cuba and to provide Castro with a domestic propaganda victory when his political stock is at an alltime low. What is even more shocking, some \$480,000 of the total sum to be given Castro will come from U.S. contributions. In other words, if this economic grant goes through, the United States will be in the position of having contributed funds to aid the Castro regime—despite our inter-American treaty obligations to apply sanctions to Communist Cuba.

Our Ambassador to the U.N. has announced that while the United States is opposed to this agricultural grant, there is little that can be done about the situation if the U.N. governing board approves the expenditure. I disagree. Considering the fact that the United States only last year came to the rescue of a financially floundering United Nations, I would think that the U.N. governing board might give some consideration to this country's Cuban policy commitments. As one who opposed the U.N. bond issue at the time it came before the Congress, I believe that the United States will now be forced to make a total and realistic reassessment of its contributions to the United Nations in the event Fidel Castro is given aid and economic comfort by that international organization. I intend to press for such a reassessment and reevaluation of our U.N. contribution, should this grant be approved.

There are other steps we must take to follow up on our decisive action of last autumn. Castro's ability to wage wars of subversion against the inter-American Republics must be curbed. For this is the underlying danger of the Castro cancer—that it will be permitted to spread throughout the hemisphere by subversive force.

While we have acted firmly against Soviet missiles in Cuba, we must now move as strongly against the threat of Soviet sub-

version. We must, in effect, dismantle Castro's Cuba as a Communist training ground for the hemisphere. Here the Organization of American States must take joint action to control and watch the movement of Castro's subversive agents from and to Cuba and other countries of Latin America.

Yet another OAS area for action would be to deny the use of ports throughout the Americas to vessels of the Sino-Soviet bloc engaged in Cuban trade. Such action would sharply limit the ability of Castro's Communist allies to provide economic support to his failing regime. It would also be in keeping with the intent of the OAS resolution applying economic sanctions against Communist Cuba.

There are, of course, other firm steps that can and must be taken if we are to cleanse our hemisphere of the immediate threat of Castro and communism. But our ultimate goal will be reached only if we maintain the will and resolve President Kennedy demonstrated 3 months ago.

Meanwhile our long-range problems in Latin America cannot be overlooked. Toward this end, the Alliance for Progress can in time advance the cause of hemispheric freedom and progress. Nevertheless, the ultimate success of the Alliance depends on our success in meeting the immediate military-political threat posed by Castro.

We cannot relax vigilance so long as Fidel Castro controls Cuba. Air surveillance remains our best protection against missile threats—but the only true protection against the total Communist threat to our hemisphere lies in the removal of Castro communism from power in Havana. That is the unfinished business of the Western Hemisphere.

So long as Castro and communism rule Cuba, Cubans are condemned to a life of want, tyranny, and terror. Their island is a prison and they are captives of international communism. Our Nation's responsibility, as the leader of the hemisphere and of the entire free world, is to redeem the entire Cuban people from their captivity. This is an obligation which we must meet—not only for the people of Cuba, but for all the people of the Americas.

NO U.S. MONEY FOR CUBA

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1961, I called attention to the proposal under which the U.N. planned to provide over \$3 million for an agricultural research project for Cuba. At that time, I pointed out the anti-American bias of the Castro regime and the fact that the United States would contribute over 40 percent of the funds involved.

I urged Ambassador Adlai Stevenson to use his influence to block approval of the allocation of these funds to the Castro regime.

This project was approved by the Governing Council in the U.N. in spite of U.S. objections. A news article on January 8, 1963, indicated that the project is certainly very much alive.

For us to support the project was ridiculous in 1961, but it is fantastic today in view of all that has intervened in the meantime.

In order to support Ambassador Stevenson, who will continue to oppose final approval of this project, I have sent the following letter. I hope that all Members will support the Ambassador in his efforts.

JANUARY 15, 1963.

HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I have read with interest the proposal that our delegation to the U.N. oppose the project for the agricultural experimental station in Cuba under the U.N. Special Fund.

I thought that this project was ridiculous when it first was discussed in the press in May of 1961 and you may recall the letter to that effect which I wrote to you on May 26 of that year.

Although the U.S. delegate objected to the Cuban project on technical and administrative grounds in May of 1961, the project was approved by the Governing Council. Events since 1961 have underlined the hostility of the Cuban regime to the United States and it is clearly stretching the demands of international friendship too far to maintain that these require us to share in any assistance to the Castro regime, however indirect it may be. It should be remembered that our share in any project would be approximately 40 percent.

I must emphasize to you that final approval of this project would cause a lessening of U.N. support in the country and would inevitably be reflected in the Congress.

I want you to know that I support your determination to fight this project.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AT AGE 60

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would lower age requirements for full social security benefits to 60 years for both men and women.

This legislation, if approved by Congress, would help to bring about a better balance of the economy and give to millions of needy citizens an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of automation and to better share in the Nation's increasing productivity and wealth.

Unemployment and economic distress in many areas of the Nation, and particularly in my own Sixth District of Pennsylvania, would be alleviated by this proposal. It would create additional job opportunities, and would bring a measure of security to individuals over 60 years who find it almost impossible to find gainful employment.

Another proposal, Mr. Speaker, which I made in a bill introduced on the opening day of this new Congress would increase income tax exemptions from \$600 to \$800.

Both of these bills are designed to strengthen our economy at the base. They would put needed purchasing power into the hands of those who need it

most. These bills would bring a measure of social justice to individuals and families and those 20 percent of our fellow citizens who are denied the opportunity of a decent livelihood in the midst of great national surpluses and prosperity.

The very first step in tax reduction should be an increase in exemptions. Together with improved social security legislation it would be a big factor for progress, prosperity, and national strength.

PROMOTIONS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill intended to change the effective date of promotions of certain employees from the actual date of promotion prior to the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, to the effective date of such pay act.

Employees who were promoted prior to the new pay act were guaranteed a minimum increase equal to one step increase of the grade from which promoted. Under the new pay act, they are entitled to the equivalent of two step increases of the grade from which promoted. In addition, many employees gained an additional grade upon conversion under the new pay act by reason of having served certain periods of service in the top steps of their former grades.

In order to appreciate the magnitude of the problem, there is set forth below the effect of promotion of two employees in the same unit, both having more than 2 years of service in the top step, step 6 of GS-14, who were promoted to GS-15, employee A on August 1, 1962, under the old pay law and employee B 3 months later on November 1, 1962, under the new pay law.

Employee A:	
Rate for step 6, GS-14.....	\$13,510
Promoted Aug. 1, 1962, minimum increase.....	260
Total.....	13,770
Employee B:	
Step 6, GS-14, no promotion.....	13,510
On conversion, employee advances to step 7 at new rate.....	15,395
Employee A:	
New rate in GS-15, step 2.....	14,055
Conversion after promotion under Public Law 87-793, GS-15, step 2.....	15,045
Employee B:	
Promotion on Nov. 1, 1962, employee now gets minimum increase equal to 2 step rates.....	950
Promoted to GS-15, step 5.....	16,485

Employee A, promoted on August 1, 1962, is now receiving \$15,045. If he had not been promoted at all, he would be receiving \$15,395. Thus, the employee would now be receiving \$350 more per year if he had not been promoted at all.

Employee B, who was promoted after Public Law 87-793, is now receiving \$16,-

485, or \$1,440 more than employee A, who is receiving \$15,045.

This bill will make the promotion for employee A effective after conversion under Public Law 87-793 and advance him to step 5, GS-15, \$16,485, the same as employee B.

OVERTIME PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which provides that postal employees who work on Saturday or Sunday during the month of December will henceforth be paid for such service at the overtime rate.

In effect, my bill will make it impossible for postmasters or other postal officials to give employees compensatory time for Saturday or Sunday work in December instead of giving them overtime pay.

The institution of compensatory time is in itself a peculiar one and it is rarely come upon outside of the postal service. The system provides for a man, who works on a Saturday or Sunday, to take a corresponding amount of time off from the job during the next 5 working days.

There is an excellent argument against the use of this device at any time, but during the month of December the argument, in my opinion, is irrefutable.

We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that when a regular employee is given compensatory time, he must be replaced by a substitute, or a utility carrier or—particularly in December—by a temporary employee. These inexperienced employees do not know their jobs as well as does the regular employee and, consequently, the service suffers whenever and wherever they are used.

While this is never good, in December it creates very real problems. There are no slack days in the postal service in December. There are no days when the Post Office Department can afford inexperienced help. During the early part of the month the mails are loaded with circulars for Christmas sales and other purposes connected with the holiday season. And, of course, the avalanche of Christmas mail comes right upon the heels of this opening burst of strenuous activity. You cannot employ inexperienced help or casual labor instead of the experienced regular employees during this season without impairing the quality of the service to a marked degree.

This happened widely during the Christmas 1962 season. The Post Office Department has often, in the past, had excellent cause to congratulate itself on the quality of service it rendered during the Christmas rush. It has no such cause for self-congratulation on the job it did during the Christmas season of 1962.

The complaints have been widespread and bitter. Great backlogs developed in many of our post offices. In one city in the State of Ohio, I know, mail was still

being delivered on Christmas Day—a condition that had been rendered extinct in recent years.

This relative breakdown of the postal service during last December was directly attributable to the overzealousness of postal officials in using the compensatory time device as a means of saving an extra dollar or two at the expense of the American public. The breakdown would not have occurred if the regular, trained, experienced employee had been permitted to stay on the job and move the mails in an efficient manner.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, these overzealous postal officials are being pennywise and pound foolish in using this device. The savings effected are far less than they claim them to be—and they are not worth the confusion and chaos they create. In the long run, it is always more economical to move the mail through the post offices and out onto the routes swiftly. Inexperienced casual labor is always expensive and always inefficient. By the use of this device in December, the postal authorities are crippling the service and they are saving very little money. They are also defacing the proud image of the postal system at a time when every American citizen has a right to expect the ultimate in fast and courteous mail service.

There is apparently no way to prevent postal officials from persisting in shortsighted petty economies other than to make such foolish practices illegal. The bill that I am introducing will do this. It will also insure that the American people will have postal service during December of which they can be proud and on which they can rely with complete faith.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill to extend to all groups in the postal field service the provisions of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. The new bill number is H.R. 1819.

It is my intention, and I believe it is the intention of the Congress, to include, without favor to any one group, such benefits to employees and their dependents, as are spelled out in present law.

Specifically, my bill affects the membership of the National Association of Post Office Mail Handlers, Watchmen, Messengers & Group Leaders.

The final hours, and even minutes, of the 1962 session ended at the very time my bill, which had been unanimously approved by the House and was awaiting Senate action. This means the bill must go the same route once more to become law.

I intend to relieve the hardships now being imposed upon the Mail Handlers who, by administrative inaction, are barred from inclusion under the act,

Much of the detailed interest in my bill last year was performed by my energetic friend, Harold McAvory, president of the Mail Handlers.

I shall continue to expect the same aid this year and look forward to the assistance of Chairman MURRAY who helped guide the bill last year.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE ELDERLY

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign last fall, various civic groups in my District, and particularly the Venice Civic Union, brought to my attention the plight of elderly property owners who find it impossible to secure financing for necessary home repairs. Although the present legislative authority under FHA should be adequate to meet the home repair financing of older people, that authority has produced little practical effect. The fact that FHA has such authority is one thing, but FHA does not actually make the loans; it only guarantees loans made by private lending institutions, and lenders are generally reluctant to make long-term loans to older people, both because of their age and because of their low income.

Several recent measures have been designed to alleviate the situation, particularly the Senior Citizens Housing Act. This has been of immeasurable value in many ways. So has the present authority to accept cosigners. These bills were particularly slanted, however, toward multifamily housing and new construction. FNMA's housing for the elderly fund, set up by Presidential order, is used only for home mortgages and rental housing, rather than home improvements.

These bills do not take into consideration the needs of the couple with a small retirement income, the couple living in their own home, which is fully paid for, but which needs a new roof, or repairs to a sagging porch. Multiply this couple by a few hundred, and we find an entire neighborhood in danger of becoming a so-called blighted area.

To permit maximum efficacy of the present law, I have therefore introduced H.R. 410, with the simple title, "To amend the National Housing Act to help elderly persons obtain FHA assistance in home repair financing." The bill makes specific provisions that individuals or organizations, such as churches, unions, and civic clubs, are acceptable as cosigners. This will serve to give emphasis to the present authority and encourage its use. No additional appropriation is required. H.R. 410 merely proposes to earmark part of the fund already established under the Federal National Mortgage Association's special assistance program.

Your support for H.R. 410 is most earnestly solicited.

WAURIKA PROJECT URGENTLY NEEDED

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the southwestern portion of Oklahoma lies a watershed drained by Beaver and Cow Creeks, tributaries of the Red River, comprised primarily of four counties, Jefferson, Stephens, Comanche, and Cotton. Six cities, Lawton, Waurika, Temple, Walters, Comanche and Duncan, a large oil refinery and a major military installation, Fort Sill, are located in this watershed. It is a typical mid-America rural-urban community area. There are farms boasting some of the most fertile land in the West. There are regional industries of varied types, an important oil refinery and the many activities characterizing a representative mixed rural and urban region.

The area does, however, have a most serious problem, caused by its geographical situation which sets it apart from many similar regions. This is basically a problem of water. Water in the form of sudden heavy downpours which come annually, and in many years several times a year. The flash floods resulting from upward of 4 inches of rain in a very brief period have year after year visited this region wreaking havoc, generally destroying property valued in the millions of dollars, wasting away fertile land and bringing the local economy to a virtual standstill.

Such are the vagaries of nature that almost invariably these violent storms and hazardous floods are succeeded by a period of up to 4 months with no rain at all. Farms suffer, crops wither and die, industries and homes are starved for water. Again the economy is jeopardized.

Cities in the area which are dependent for their water supply upon lakes, streams, and wells find the lakes shriveling, streams only a dusty trail, and the water table sinking ever lower. Water is of necessity rationed, industry is paralyzed, farm stock and farm folk are forced to extreme measures to survive.

Cities have nearly exhausted themselves physically and financially in search of a supply of vital water. Industries hardly able to survive, even by such costly and inefficient means as utilizing processed sewage, are unable to expand to their full potential or to provide more jobs for the increasing population. The lack of favorable and consistent supplies of water has made it impossible to attract new industries to the region.

Fertile soil, planted year after year, fails to produce. The luscious products which it is potentially capable of producing fail because the soil is alternately washed over by floods and parched for lack of rain during the growing season.

This is no recent development. As long ago as 1903 the Bureau of Reclamation was cognizant of the problem. In 1936 the Corps of Engineers made a sur-

vey of the Waurika area as an integral part of the Red River Basin which resulted in a recommended multipurpose program of development for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, irrigation, water supply, and other purposes.

Again in 1947 the Bureau of Reclamation studied the area. In 1952 the University of Texas conducted a survey under contract with the Bureau of Reclamation which demonstrated the serious need for additional water supplies in the four-county area.

In 1955 the important Arkansas-White-Red Interagency Committee developed a long range, comprehensive plan of development. The recommendations included plans for the Waurika-Beaver Creek development and stated that it was justifiable and feasible at that time. That same year the Beaver-Cow Creek Watershed Development Association was organized to further the interests of the region and has remained active to the present time, participating in every effort to improve the situation. Its members have appeared time after time at hearing after hearing, in the region, in the State capitol, and in Washington before the departments and congressional committees concerned. These are seriously troubled and highly responsible people. They deserve every consideration.

The 1956 survey by the Bureau of Reclamation resulted in a 1957 report recommending a reservoir at Waurika providing primarily for irrigation and water supply.

In 1960 bills were introduced to implement the Bureau recommendations in both the Senate and House but no action resulted. In September of 1961 the Bureau of Reclamation forwarded a detailed feasibility report on the Waurika project to the Congress. The report had the approval of all the Federal, State, and local agencies affected.

It provided for construction of a dam and reservoir on Beaver Creek, 5 miles upstream from the city of Waurika.

The proposed 93-foot-high dam would provide a reservoir with a holding capacity of 250,000 acre-feet. Water stored in this reservoir would be used to irrigate 2,000 acres of land in Jefferson County and to supply six cities and an oil refinery near Duncan by a system of aqueducts.

Total cost of the project as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation was estimated at \$25,019,500 of which \$15,856,500 would be reimbursed, with interest, by municipalities and industries concerned; \$4,044,300 of the cost allocated to irrigation would be repaid in full by water users. The flood control allocation of \$2,264,800; the allocation of \$2,486,400 to fish and wildlife conservation, and the allocation of \$367,500 to recreation all would be nonreimbursable.

The dam and reservoir would provide 95,300 acre-feet of flood control. It would effectively prevent floods along Beaver Creek from the damsite to its confluence with Cow Creek and substantially reduce flood hazards below that point. Operation of this capacity would be in accordance with the plans of the Corps of Engineers.

As has become essential with every modern reservoir project, consideration was given to the recreational potential in this report. Minimum Federal expenditures for this purpose would include access roads; additional expenditures by the State and local agencies would be expected.

The report suggested that some 3,500 acres of land beside that needed for the reservoir be purchased and incorporated in a national wildlife refuge in the interest of fish and wildlife conservation and to replace upland game habitat inundated or impaired by construction of the Waurika Reservoir.

I introduced a bill to implement this project in 1961 and Senator Kerr did likewise in the Senate. Following hearings by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee the Senator's bill, S. 114, was passed by the Senate. The fact that Waurika was again visited by a damaging flash flood in June last, while this bill was under consideration, enabled me to focus attention on the immediacy of the problem. This was no doubt influential in securing the inclusion of the project in the omnibus river and harbor flood control bill passed by the Senate. Unfortunately it was ultimately eliminated by the conferees from the bill as finally approved by the Congress.

However, the gentleman from Tennessee, who performed so nobly as conference manager for the House, noted in the conference report and affirmed on October 12, 1962, on the floor of the House, that, although it had been eliminated the managers made a commitment that the Committee on Public Works of the House would hold public hearings on it as soon as practicable after the new Congress convened.

On October 31, 1962, the Senate Public Works Committee by resolution directed the Corps of Engineers to make a survey report on Waurika Reservoir.

On December 10, 1962, public hearings were held by the corps in Waurika, following which a report was prepared by the district engineer at Tulsa, and reviewed by the division engineer at Dallas and forwarded to the Board of Engineers in Washington.

The report is favorable to the construction of the Waurika Reservoir as a multiple purpose reservoir. It favors construction of the irrigation project by the Bureau of Reclamation, the creation of a national wildlife refuge by acquisition of additional land and the providing of recreational facilities. This report differs only in detail from the Bureau of Reclamation report, and the estimated cost is about the same, \$25,100,000.

We now have the two great Federal conservation and water resource development construction agencies in almost complete agreement on details and absolutely complete agreement on the urgent need for the Waurika project. Differences in minor details can easily be cleared up in congressional hearings.

The essential thing is to proceed immediately. There is very little opposition to the project. Several Federal agencies have already cooperated in the studies and have expressed willingness to

participate in completing the project. The Governor of Oklahoma, now the distinguished junior Senator from my State, has testified, along with the State conservation agencies, on its behalf.

The six cities concerned have given evidence of their willingness and ability to pay their proportional share of costs as have the prospective water users of the proposed irrigation project.

All of the thousands of people who are vitally concerned do not seek charity nor a handout. They are willing and able to help themselves but a project of this scale is beyond their ability to accomplish entirely on their own.

They deserve a helping hand to spare them from the heartbreak of being constantly wiped out by floods, or having to do without water, without the jobs which would materialize were it not for the absence of reliable water supplies.

The urgency of the problem is immediate. I ask for your support in bringing hope to these long suffering people in the Waurika area by my State of Oklahoma.

Action on six other needed projects is predicted on favorable action on the Waurika project.

RAILROAD MERGERS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been an outspoken critic of proposed railroad mergers. Such mergers, in the past, have resulted in large layoffs among railway employees, decreased service, and less efficient management due to the size of the operation.

Our railroads continually stress their financial plight and use this as a weapon to push their merger plans. Once again I bring attention to the fallacy of such claims as pointed out in a recent letter distributed by the Railway Labor Executives' Association under date of January 7, 1963.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the chairman's letter which follows:

RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The railroads of the United States say they are very poor, on the verge of bankruptcy. They use the poverty plea to back up mergers, layoffs of employees, curtailment and abandonment of services, and ripping up of tracks.

If they are as poor as they claim, where do the railroads get the billions of dollars they have paid out in dividends?

Their own reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission belie their poverty claims. Here are the figures: In the last 20 years the railroads have paid out a whopping \$7,388 million in dividends. And in each 5-year period of those 20, the total dividends have gone up—from \$1,384 million for 1941-45 to \$2,271 million for 1956-60.

That is not all. According to the figures the railroads gave the ICC, U.S. railroads added \$279,767,006 to retained net income in 1961. Indications are that 1962 will show

better gains. Poor's Investment Advisory Service, December 3, 1962, estimates class I railroad net income to be between \$475 and \$500 million for the year 1962. That's a gain of \$382 million over 1961.

Net income alone is not the true index of the fiscal status of the railroads. The sums set aside for depreciation added to the net income cash flow give a more realistic picture of railroad finances. Depreciation in 1961 was, in round numbers, \$652 million, an increase of \$17 million over 1960. The railroad depreciation figure has risen almost \$100 million in the last 20 years. The average yearly depreciation for the 5 years, 1941-45 was \$553 million.

The total cash flow has gone up steadily for the base periods since 1941-45, when it averaged \$1,231 million. For 1947-52, the cash flow total was \$1,151 millions and for the most recent 8 years 1953-61, the annual average was \$1,274 million.

How many sets of books the railroads keep we don't know. They seem to produce figures to suit the necessities of the current story they are trying to sell to the public.

Because the railroads are the arteries through which the lifeblood of our commerce flows, we think this uncertainty must be ended and the whole truth of railroad finances laid bare. Only Congress can do that. We ask you to make your voice heard for a thorough investigation of the financial condition of U.S. railroads. That, we insist, is the only way the ills, real and imaginary, of the railroads can be intelligently diagnosed and the proper cure prescribed.

So the public can be informed, we are inserting an advertisement "Exposing the Railroad 'Poverty' Myth," in newspapers throughout the country on Tuesday, January 8, 1963. Copy of the advertisement is enclosed.

Sincerely,

G. E. LEIGHTY,
Chairman.

A well-known transportation authority, Mr. Eli L. Oliver, in a recent interview stated that railway management's claim that they are losing their proportionate share of freight traffic "just is not so." He said that the railroads are hauling just as great a proportion of freight today as they did 25 or 50 years ago. He points out that they carried 200 billion more ton-miles in 1960 than in 1940. Rail traffic went up 53 percent in those two decades, while our population went up only 36 percent. Railway traffic has grown half again as fast as our population.

I agree with Mr. Oliver when he says that we can easily be swayed into thinking that freight traffic has been taken away from the railroads when we see scores of trucks rolling down the turnpikes. But, as Mr. Oliver commented in his interview:

From that turnpike you don't see the crossings where you used to be held up while freight trains of 60 or 80 cars crawled past you. That grade crossing has been made an underpass or an overpass; and along the tracks strings of diesel locomotives, 8 or 10 together, are moving freight trains of 150, 200, and even 300 cars. A train of 100 cars is about 1 mile long—300 cars are 3 miles long. Each holds the equal of four or five truckloads, and is moving faster than your highway speed limit.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under the constitution of the Interparliamentary Union, every Member of this House is a member of the American Interparliamentary Group. The American Group will meet on Monday, January 21, in the conference room, S-207, on the principal floor of the Senate wing of this building. Those who are interested in this organization either from the standpoint of cooperating in its work or criticizing its actions are invited to attend.

This is an organization in which the U.S.S.R. takes a great interest and makes a great effort to direct the viewpoint of members. Those of us who have participated in the work of the American Group for a number of years feel it is important to the United States to present our side of the picture. We believe we were able to do this at the last meeting which was held in Brasilia just at the time of the outbreak of the Cuban crisis. At this meeting the Soviets supported a resolution declaring that the American blockade was threatening the peace of the world and calling on the United States by name to present our problems to the United Nations. We of the American delegation were able to change this resolution so as to eliminate all reference to the American blockade, pointing out that there were many threats to the peace, including the Chinese conflict with India, and expressing the hope that all nations would compose their differences without war. Our revision carried by a vote of 66 to 16.

I believe that this is conclusive evidence that we can expect the support of many of the countries of the world if we will but present our case to them. I think it is also abundantly clear that we need not abandon our position of leadership to the Soviet Union. But, of course, if Members of the Congress care to undercut this organization without any knowledge whatever of its actual operations, they can do this country irreparable harm. I would, therefore, urge that before we have any more criticism of the IPU as a "secret, junketing society" that Members attend the meetings and participate in the work of the organization.

Let me again repeat: There will be a meeting Monday next in room S-207 at 10:30 a.m., and you are invited.

HEARINGS ON WOMEN'S STRIKE FOR PEACE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, quite a few Members in this legislative body, evidently having received communications

from some of their constituents or having read cynical comments in some newspaper or magazine, have asked for the text of the opening statement which I read on December 11, 1962, at the opening of the House Committee on Un-American Activities public hearings of Women's Strike for Peace here at the Nation's Capital. Manifestly, because of the interest in these hearings, I believe I am justified in calling to the attention of the membership of this body the full text of such opening statement, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.; SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN'S OPENING STATEMENT, DECEMBER 11, 1962; HON. CLYDE DOYLE, CHAIRMAN OF SUBCOMMITTEE

Everyone in the world, every nation in the world—if you can believe their words—wants peace. The cry is universal. It comes from neutralists, from Communists, from anti-Communists. Yet there is no peace because certain persons, groups and nations in the world—even while they cry peace—foment war and unrest. They plot and carry out military attacks on neutralist India, on anti-Communist South Vietnam. They plot sabotage in the United States. They dynamite electric power stations in Venezuela. In every nation, in small and in big ways, they disrupt peace or make it impossible of attainment.

There is good reason, unfortunately, to doubt Communist claims that they desire peace, as others understand the term. Late in 1948, Stalin launched a spectacular peace offensive. It was marked in major nations of the world by so-called peace conferences and congresses, which were supported and attended by the cream of the Communist and fellow-traveling intellectual crop in those nations. A Moscow-directed World Peace Council, still operating in Vienna, was born of these gatherings. In June 1950, however, even as Stalin was directing the creation of this so-called World Peace Council (which was formally established about 5 months later), he launched a military attack on South Korea. That attack marked the beginning of 3 years' undeclared war between the forces of communism and freedom. Over 33,000 Americans were killed in battle in that Communist peace action. More than 123,000 other Americans were casualties of it—20,000 of them also losing their lives.

These facts alone indicate that we must give careful consideration to just what the word "peace" means to Communists. Studying what they say about war will help us determine what they mean by peace.

A pamphlet on basic Communist doctrine prepared by the National Education Department of the U.S. Communist Party and sold in Communist Party bookstores in the United States at the very time Stalin's peace offensive was at its peak—and during the Korean war—made the following doctrinal statement:

"Wars do not occur through accidents of history or the mistakes of statesmen. They are the inevitable result of capitalism and its contradictions."

Volume 8 of the Large Soviet Encyclopedia (Bol'shaia sovetskaiia entsiklopedia), published in 1951, defines war as follows (p. 570):

"War is a social phenomenon inherent in a society containing classes and antagonism."

Two pages later, in its discussion of war, the encyclopedia states:

"Wars will cease only with the destruction of capitalism and the victory of the socialist system in all the world."

Again, the Small Soviet Encyclopedia (Malaia sovetskaiia entsiklopedia), third edition, volume 2, published in 1958, states:

"The basic cause for contemporary wars is the capitalist economic system and the irreconcilable internal contradictions in it."

In other words, according to fundamental Communist doctrine, there will be wars—there can be no real peace—as long as capitalism exists. To end wars, to achieve peace, capitalism must be destroyed.

According to their own words, Communists believe that there can be no real peace until they have conquered the world, eliminating all other systems. They say to one another, and to those who will make an effort to study their doctrine, that they really do not believe in peace in our time.

Why then do they talk of peace?

Because it serves Communist interests in two ways:

1. The initiated Communist, understanding his Marxist-Leninist doctrine, knows that a Moscow call to intensify the "fight for peace" means that he should intensify his fight to destroy capitalism and its major bastion, the United States. This is the way to peace—according to his Communist doctrine. Thus Communist peace propaganda is a call to action for all Communists, spurring them to increased activity and effort aimed at achieving the Communist goal of world conquest—by war or any other means.

2. As events have proved, peace propaganda and agitation have a disarming, mollifying, confusing and weakening effect on those nations which are the intended victims of communism. Moreover, throughout history, aggressors, dictators, and governments bent on conquering others, or the whole world, have known that pacifism or an unrealistic and exaggerated desire for peace on the part of their intended victims is a tremendous asset to ultimate victory for the aggressor. Excessive concern with peace on the part of any nation impedes or prevents adequate defense preparation, hinders effective diplomacy in the national interest, undermines the will to resist and saps national strength. For this reason, in today's world, intense peace propaganda and agitation in non-Communist nations obviously serves the aggressive plans of world communism.

In 1917, Lenin wrote:

"We are not pacifists. We are opposed to imperialist wars for the division of spoils among the capitalists, but we have always declared it to be absurd for the revolutionary proletariat to renounce revolutionary wars that may prove necessary in the interests of socialism."

This is still Communist doctrine. It was restated in only slightly different words in a declaration unanimously adopted by 81 of the world's Communist parties which met in Moscow in November-December 1960, to devise the strategy they hope will bring them world victory.

This same unanimously adopted statement had other things to say which are vitally important to all Americans and which touch on the purpose of these hearings. I quote:

"Today, as never before, it is important to fight perseveringly in all countries to make the peace movement thrive and extend to towns and villages, factories and offices."

On January 6, 1961, shortly after this meeting, Khrushchev made a major strategy speech directed to Communists in all parts of the world. He said, in part:

"Every day bigger sections of the population should be drawn into the struggle for peace. . . . The banner of peace enables us to rally the masses around us. By holding aloft this banner we will be even more successful."

Following Khrushchev's cue and also the declaration of the 81 Communist parties,

U.S. Communist Party leader Gus Hall, in a major report to the party's national committee on January 20, 1961, made the following statement:

"It is necessary to widen the struggle for peace, to raise its level, to involve far greater numbers, to make it an issue in every community, every people's organization, every labor union, every church, every house, every street, every point of gathering of our people. . . ."

"It is imperative to bring everyone—men, women, youth, and yes, even children—into the struggle. . . ."

"It is essential to give full support to the existing peace bodies, to their movements and the struggles they initiate, to building and strengthening their organizations. . . ."

"It is also necessary to recognize the need for additional peace organizations. . . ."

"Above all Communists will intensify their work for peace, and their efforts to build up peace organizations."

These very blunt Communist statements make one thing very clear:

Present Communist strategy gives No. 1 priority to peace agitation and propaganda in the United States and all other non-Communist nations. It calls for Communist infiltration of and support for existing peace organizations, Communist or non-Communist. It calls for the creation of new peace organizations, controlled or infiltrated and manipulated by Communists. It calls for assemblies, picket lines, marches, delegations, walks—every possible kind of demonstration for so-called peace.

Basically, it is because of the Communist directives I have just quoted that these hearings are being held. Preliminary investigation by the committee indicates that Communists, in carrying out these directives—as they would be expected to do—have both infiltrated existing peace groups and created or infiltrated newly formed organizations.

For reasons already discussed, this Communist activity intensifies the security problems faced by this Nation. This is internal psychopolitical warfare directed by Moscow and waged within our own borders. The aim of this activity is not peace, but the undermining and sabotage of the United States.

The question of peace, disarmament, nuclear weapons testing, and related matters are the gravest issues confronting the United States today. It is vital that the Congress be informed whether, and to what extent, concealed agents of a foreign power are attempting to influence the decisions which must be made on these questions—and to influence the decisions so they will serve not the interests of the United States but a foreign power dedicated to the destruction of freedom everywhere.

The subject of this inquiry is to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in peace organizations, particularly in the Metropolitan New York area and with special reference to the Women Strike for Peace—and also to determine the degree to which Communists have responded to the previously quoted directives that they engage in such activity. Such information, as the resolution authorizing these hearings indicates, is relevant to certain legislative proposals now pending before the committee.

The committee wishes to emphasize these points before the hearings begin:

The fact that Communists are active in peace agitation does not mean that everyone who agitates for peace is a Communist or fellow traveler.

The fact that Communists have created and infiltrated peace organizations does not

mean that all peace groups are Communist or that all members of them, or even a majority of them, are Communists, Communist sympathizers, or fellow travelers.

As I stated in the opening of these remarks, the cry for peace is universal. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of many people who are today agitating and calling for peace, even though we may have reason to doubt the wisdom of some of the actions and statements made by these people.

The subject and legislative purpose of these hearings are set forth in a resolution adopted by the committee on August 2, 1962. That resolution reads as follows:

"Be it resolved, That hearings by the Committee on Un-American Activities, or a subcommittee thereof, be held in Washington, D.C., or at such other place or places as the chairman may determine, on such date or dates as the chairman may designate, relating to Communist conspiratorial techniques and propaganda used in implementing Soviet and U.S. Communist Party directives within the United States, with special reference to the so-called united front tactics of the Communist Party, and the Communist Party tactics of infiltration of non-Communist organizations; the legislative purpose being to determine the need for amendment of the Internal Security Act of 1950, so as to make its provisions applicable to persons engaged in such activities, and for the additional legislative purpose of obtaining information designed to aid the committee and Congress in determining whether the Internal Security Act of 1950 should be amended in a manner to make unlawful membership in the Communist Party of the United States, as proposed in H.R. 9944, referred to this committee on the 30th day of January 1962; be it further

"Resolved, That any subcommittee appointed pursuant to this resolution be authorized to hear any other matter within the jurisdiction of the committee."

The order for appointment of this subcommittee, for the record, reads as follows:

NOVEMBER 9, 1962.

FRANCIS J. McNAMARA,
Director, Committee on Un-American Activities:

Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the rules of this committee, I hereby appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Hon. CLYDE DOYLE as chairman, and Hon. WILLIAM M. TUCK and Hon. DONALD C. BRUCE as associate members, to conduct a hearing in Washington, D.C., Tuesday, December 11, 1962, at 10 a.m., on subjects under investigation by the committee and take such testimony on said day or succeeding days, as it may deem necessary.

Please make this action a matter of committee record.

If any Member indicates his inability to serve, please notify me.

Given under my hand this 9th day of November 1962.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

GEN. JOHN KNIGHT WATERS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Chicago, and especially of the Second Congressional District, within which is located the headquarters of the 5th Army, I am happy to extend heartiest congratulations to a great American soldier who, by action of the President of the United States and with approval by the Senate, will become a full general in the Army of our country and the commanding general of the U.S. Continental Command. There are only 12 full generals in our Army and Gen. John Knight Waters at 56 will be among the youngest who have attained that exalted position.

The people of Chicago were overjoyed when they learned of the promotion of the present commanding general of the 5th Army. During his sojourn with us General Waters has won the hearts of all our people. He is a great American in every sense of the word and his human qualities are no less than his qualities of military genius.

He has served with outstanding distinction as commandant at West Point, as commanding general in Germany and in other capacities. He is further entrenched in the affections of the American people by his relationship as son-in-law to General Patton and the finest traditions of the military service that the father-in-law carried even to the hour of his unfortunate death, the son-in-law continues to carry on.

Mr. Speaker, the local office that I maintain for the service of my constituents is located in the headquarters of the 5th Army. It is there that I spend my time and meet my constituents when I am able to leave Washington. My contacts with General Waters have been most pleasant in every respect. I have never known a finer gentleman or an abler and more dedicated officer.

To Maj. Gen. Charles D. Dodge, soon to be elevated to the rank of lieutenant general and who will succeed General Waters as commanding general of the 5th Army, also go the congratulations and best wishes of the people of Chicago and especially of the Second Congressional District.

TAX RELIEF FOR OLDER PERSONS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, recently, I introduced a bill, H.R. 1764, to provide older persons a certain degree of tax relief when they reach the age at which they may dispose of the family home.

The tax relief proposed in my bill would depend upon these conditions: First, the individual, or in the case of a married couple either the husband or wife, must have reached age 65; second, the home must have been the principal residence; and third, it must have been

owned at least for a period of 5 years. Under these conditions the gain realized from the sale of the older person's home would be exempt from both the Federal income tax and the capital gains tax unless the sales price exceeded \$30,000.

We, in the Congress, seem to be continually trying to face up to the housing, income, and health needs of older persons. Low cost public housing has been and will continue to be a special problem as applied to one group of older persons. Those who have acquired homes of their own constitute another group no less deserving of the attention of the Congress. They have had the initiative to acquire and support a home. They have paid the local and State taxes regularly levied on homes and other real property. I cannot believe the Congress intends to make life more difficult for these older persons by continuing to levy a heavy capital gains tax at this difficult time of life—the time of transition from an earning to a nonearning status.

I believe the Congress should take action soon to lift this unnecessary tax burden from those older citizens who find it desirable or necessary to sell their homes.

A high percentage of our aging population does not own their own homes. Most of those who do own their homes have acquired them under the common pattern of contract buying month by month over a period of 15, 20, or 30 years. Purchase of the property was a longtime outlay of work, care, and planning for a family home. The transaction was not primarily a business investment, as such, but the acquisition of a home in which to live and rear a family. The capital gain in connection with the older person's home deserves, therefore, entirely different treatment from that of a business investment as such.

Most older persons sell their homes for reasons beyond their control. Often, because of declining health conditions of the wife or husband, the family physician recommends that they move to a more favorable climate. In such a case and at that time of life, the person or couple may be reluctant to buy another home. However, under our present tax laws, unless they buy within 1 year, they are subject to our Federal capital gains tax. In fact, every dollar levied by our Federal Government on such a couple or individual obviously depletes the fund available to rent or buy in a new and presumably more favorable climate. The effect of our present capital gains tax on the older person, I believe, constitutes too much regulation, too much control over his activity at this stage of his life. In the example I have given, the effect is to penalize the older person if he follows the advice of his physician and prepares to move to a more favorable location.

The capital gain as defined in our tax policies is all too often the result of paper profits created by the decreased purchasing power of the dollar. Nevertheless, the paper profit does appear and

under present law must bear the tax. This fact alone can be a determining factor in preventing the older person or couple from making the change to housing more suited to their needs and to their ability to pay.

During his active earning years, the wage earner's occupation may have required him to have his residence in a more expensive urban center. Assuming he may upon retirement need to migrate to a rural or less populated area of the country, our tax laws are such that we either restrict his freedom of movement or we penalize him for no more than selling the family home at the end of his earning lifetime.

Frequently the older individual or couple finds upon reaching the end of his earning lifetime that his home, paid for over his lifetime, is about the only tangible wealth he possesses. He may need to sell the home and place the proceeds in a paid-up annuity or a lifetime home contract for elderly persons. Under our present Federal tax policy, we require that such an individual or couple ordinarily pay a 25 percent long-term capital gains levy on the gain from the sale of the home. Without raising any question regarding the intent and the justification of our capital gains tax as such, I believe that the capital gains on an older person's home may never have been one of the specific targets of a tax bill. I have proposed this bill, therefore, in the hope that the Ways and Means Committee will give thorough and adequate study and attention to providing this much needed tax relief to this group of our older citizens.

TO HELP AMERICA MEETS ITS POTENTIAL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Manpower Retraining and Development Act, passed in the last Congress, gave recognition to the importance of developing our manpower resources. By helping meet the critical shortage of skilled labor, and there are jobs by the millions that are going begging for the need of a skilled worker to fill them, this act will help America face the challenges which progress poses and help this country meet its potential. Under the theory of this act, which seeks to give new skills to those who are unemployable because their skills are no longer in demand, we look to the future of the country and its labor needs. And this act turned away from the approach to unemployment of putting an unemployable worker on the dole in the hope that what skill he has will come once again into demand.

This was an important step which was taken to help tailor the American labor force to the economic future of our coun-

try. There is more that can be done, however, and I have today introduced four bills which are designed to operate in this area and better develop our labor resource.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXPENSE

The first of these would operate in conjunction with the Manpower Retraining Act. The act, in the long run, is intended to eliminate from the ranks of the unemployed those who are unable to gain employment because of lack of skill and, at the same time, to help meet the needs for highly skilled workers which our dynamic economic progress creates. But this is not a direct step—taking an unemployed ditch digger whose job has been ended by a ditch digging machine and transforming him into skilled technician on the latest data processing and computing machines. Many of the low-skilled unemployed cannot be trained up to the high skill level jobs. Rather than a one-step process it is a many-phased upgrading of skills generally. The Manpower Retraining Act operates only on the first level, giving the unemployed a new skill with which they can reenter the labor market.

The proposal which I am offering would help in the upgrading of skills throughout the labor force. It would provide for the deduction of amounts spent for education or training to obtain a new or better job as business expenses. At present such expenditures are deductible only if necessary to maintain existing skills or to keep a present job or job level. Under my proposal, there would be a tax incentive for those farther up the line in the labor force, farther up than those for whose benefit the Manpower Retraining Act was passed, to increase their skill levels, to seek better jobs through further education and training.

It is essential that we promote this upgrading throughout our labor force. The technological progress of our economy will call for an ever increasing level of worker competence. No longer can we be content to train sons in the jobs their fathers and grandfathers had done. The change of our economy will not allow this, for the skill and job of the father may well be obsolete when the son comes into the labor market. We must have every American working to his capacity if we are to have the country meet its potential. This involves a process of continual progress in the level of our labor force. This bill works toward this goal.

WORKER MOBILITY

A second very important requirement for our labor force if it is to meet the challenge of America's future is mobility. Just as economic progress will demand ever higher skill levels for our workers it will also require that our workers be geographically mobile to take advantage of new opportunities and to meet newly appearing needs. At present our tax laws discourage this mobility and I have offered legislation to help correct this.

The discouragement to worker mobility in our tax law revolves around the outdated concept of home. In earlier days, in days of less dramatic technological change, a worker's home was, as the tax law defines it, the principal place of his employment. Today, however, this is not the case. Technological progress, as I have noted, calls for mobility and, since most workers today own their homes, to call home the place of a worker's employment ignores the fact that he may for some extended period maintain his family at his place of residence and be employed elsewhere.

Two specific cases illustrate the operation of our tax laws to discourage worker mobility. The first deals with defense industry workers, in this instance machinists working for McDonnell Aircraft Corp., who must spend extended periods away from their homes in the process of developing modern weapons. The highly complex military hardware of today often demands long periods of testing, testing which, in the case of McDonnell products, takes place far away from the company's home office and the homes and families of the workers who must participate in these tests. Some provision is made for this type of situation in the tax laws; if there is a temporary period of employment away from home, per diem paid during this time may be considered spent for business purposes. But, the rule as to a temporary period is very narrow and if this period is indefinite, the worker's home in the tax sense follows his job.

The second situation is exemplified by the problem facing the Chrysler Corp.'s employees who transferred from a plant in Indiana to the company's new plant in St. Louis County, Mo. Their tax home went with the plant to St. Louis, but many of the workers left their families in Indiana for some period, waiting to sell their homes there and find suitable places to live in Missouri.

In both of these cases the tax laws discourage the worker from being mobile, from taking the job which will involve a period of work away from home or from taking a job away from one's present home. This is the direct opposite of what we need. We need to encourage mobility of our workers as well as we need to encourage the upgrading of their skills. Both of these will contribute materially to the achievement of our economic goals. Allowing business expense deductions for education and training and revising the tax rules as to the definition of home, making it, for a homeowner worker, the place where he owns his home and maintains his family would be significant steps toward this overall goal of helping America meet its potential.

AID TO INDIVIDUAL WORKERS

The other two bills which I am offering today, also amendments to the Internal Revenue Code allowing for the deduction of expenses involved in a worker's earning his living. These two bills deal with specific problems which affect a small number of workers, but

I believe they are important in principle for they move along the line of allowing as deductions the real expenses which one must meet to hold a job.

The first of these would allow to the taxpayer a deduction for expenses incurred in child care, permitting him to hold a job, when his wife is physically or mentally incapable of caring for their children.

The basic qualifications for this deduction would be the incapacity of the wife and the necessity of this expense for the worker to hold a job.

The second proposal would allow a deduction to disabled workers for the costs of transportation to and from work. The disabled worker has special problems in the area of transportation in many cases and, while normally such expenses are not allowed as deductions, permitting it for these workers would encourage them to offer their skills to the Nation's economy. This proposal works hand-in-hand with efforts to rehabilitate disabled workers, to bring them back into a useful and productive life. I think that this is one of the most meaningful of human activities, the rehabilitation of the individual to permit him, as nearly as possible, to live a normal life and this bill would be one small step in helping reach this goal.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR MUSEUM, LIBRARY GIFTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, within the Internal Revenue Code, in those provisions which allow for the deduction of amounts spent for certain purposes from an individual's taxable income, much incentive is given for the expenditure of funds in pursuits which have been found to be generally beneficial to our society. Indeed, this procedure strikes an interesting balance between government and private support for these activities. The Government decides generally which areas of our society should receive emphasis and whose support should be encouraged. Examples of these decisions are the areas of education and religion.

Yet, within these very general areas, and limited only by Government regulation to prevent fraud on the public, the taxpayer is free to choose the objects of his beneficence. He may give his contribution to the Catholic Church or the Methodists; he may donate to the local junior college or to a great university. In either case, his gift is deductible up to certain limits and the Government cannot coerce or favor one recipient over another in the general classes it has established. In effect, the spending power remains in the hands of the people

and through making certain gifts tax deductible, the Government encourages but cannot require an individual to spend his money in a particular way.

One of the recent advances in the area of deductions under the Internal Revenue Code is the additional 10-percent deduction allowed for certain contributions, to religious, medical, and educational charities. It provides that where an individual has reached the allowable limit—20 percent of adjusted gross income—of deductible gifts, this limit may be increased by an additional 10 percent if his contributions to qualifying charities cover this amount.

I am today introducing legislation to broaden this extra 10-percent deduction provision to include museums and libraries. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] and I cosponsored this legislation in the last Congress and it has the gentleman's endorsement again as this new Congress begins. The purpose of this bill, an amendment to section 170(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, is to open a broad new area for the application of this deduction. After this bill was introduced in the last Congress, groups interested in expanding the coverage of it contacted me and I believe that in considering this proposal, it would be well for the Congress also to look into other possible areas for the expansion of this additional deduction. Museums and libraries play an important part in education in the broadest sense. I believe that we must seek a very liberal interpretation of these provisions so that the deduction mechanism, as an encouragement to beneficial activities in our society, will be truly effective in achieving its goal.

I sincerely hope that the Congress will be able to consider this proposal and its possible extensions into other fields to encourage private spending in socially beneficial ways.

COMMITTEE FOR THE UNREPRESENTED

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able definitions of that category of economic entities known as small business is the expression that a small business is one that does not have a Washington representative. Implicit in this definition is the importance to any group in our country, with the ever-increasing role being played by the Federal Government, of having a voice in Washington, a way in which its views on the matters affecting it can be drawn to the attention of America's policymakers.

There are various channels through which these interest groups can make their feelings known. A common way is through the employment of lobbyists

and Washington attorneys knowledgeable in the ways of the Congress and the regulatory agencies. The agencies and departments themselves often act to give a forum to representatives of interest groups in the consideration of matters within their special province.

Similarly, the work of congressional committees in areas of their jurisdiction help to give a voice to the needs and opinions of the groups whose interests are touched by the legislation the committee studies. The Select Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Senate are excellent examples of this, and go along well with the definition of small business which I noted earlier.

I have today reintroduced a proposal to create in the House of Representatives a Committee on Independent Unions and Unrecognized Groups. The purpose of this proposal is to offer to these organizations a chance to have their interests weighed in with those of the other segments of our society. Just as small business before the advent of the House and Senate select committees, these groups have no representative in Washington assuring that their voices are heard, nor is there any congressional or executive body specifically attuned to meeting their problems.

In many ways these groups can be found parallel to small business. They are generally small, struggling in a competitive world to find a place and often provide an organizational context for a new idea. The idea may be good, perhaps even great, yet without a fair chance of survival in a competitive world, it might be lost. One element of survival in the United States is assuring that full consideration be given the interests of the group involved. With the many voices clamoring to be heard in the process of making public policy, it is too easy to overlook one which does not have an adequate sounding-board on the Washington scene. This committee, which I suggest, would offer the type of sounding board which would permit the interests of these groups to be given the recognition they deserve.

An example of this is found in the labor field. Concern is properly given the AFL-CIO as the largest representative of organized labor in our country. Similarly the large independent unions, an example being the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, gain recognition. Yet, some 2.7 million workers are joined in small, independent unions whose voices are seldom heard in deliberations of the Congress or policies of the executive departments and agencies. Beyond this number are many other workers, not organized into unions as such but represented to some extent by a formal grouping. It is to give a forum to these groups that I offer the proposal for the Committee on Independent Unions and Unrecognized Groups.

TAX CLASSIFICATION OF DEBIT LIFE INSURANCE SALESMEN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks

at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, those who are classified as "outside salesmen" are allowed to take as deductions from gross income the ordinary and necessary expenses of their business activities. What this means, in effect, is that having this status, one may take this form of deduction to reach adjusted gross income and then may take either the standard 10-percent deduction or his itemized deductions to compute his taxable income.

At present, most life insurance salesmen are classified as outside salesmen. One group, however, the so-called debit life insurance salesmen, is not and, because of the close similarity in the job and the means of doing it between the debit salesmen and other life insurance salesmen, I have today introduced an amendment to section 62(2)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code to equalize treatment of these two groups.

Both of these groups of insurance salesmen must hold the same license for their profession and both sell basically the same lines of insurance. The debit agent, however, also sells industrial insurance. These sales involve work away from the employers' place of business and much out-of-pocket expense for the agent. Industrial life insurance is subject to cancellation at will by the insured and premiums on it are small and fall due weekly or monthly. The agent must collect the premiums and each collection is, in essence, a new sale. These debit agents are salesmen primarily and not collectors and drawing a distinction between them and other insurance agents on the basis of a collateral collection function is unwarranted for purposes of the outside salesman section of the Internal Revenue Code.

FOR THE RELIEF OF DR. NESTOR ZENAROSA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced private legislation for the relief of Dr. Nestor Zenarosa, a medical doctor and citizen of the Philippines who is in this country on the exchange education program. Dr. Zenarosa has been in this country beyond the 5 years which, normally, is the limit allowed for doctors of medicine under the exchange program. I am sure that there is a sound basis for this general rule just as there is for the general rule that exchange visitors are to return to their home countries with the skills they have ac-

quired here and share them with the people of their native lands.

However, there are exceptional cases, and I believe that this is one of that type. Certainly, it deserves the attention of the Congress to see if it fits into general rule or might better be determined by special legislation. What my bill asks is that Dr. Zenarosa be given a further extension on his exchange visit, permitting him to complete his work under a grant he has received from the National Institutes of Health. He is doing research work in an important and relatively untouched field, the use of drugs in the treatment of arthritis. He is not asking to remain in the country permanently, only that he be given a chance to complete the research work which he has started.

SHIPPING STRIKE HURTS MISSOURI, TOO

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the sentiments expressed in this House January 10 by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], who serves as chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of this House. Certainly I share his concern over the sorry state of affairs foisted upon the United States by the prolonged labor-management dispute and current strike crippling the shipping industry.

Now, some may regard the woes of the maritime industry as outside the concern and beyond affecting the wonderful people of the Missouri Ozark district I so proudly represent. Therein lies the rub. For, so prolonged and so far-reaching have been the results of this disastrous strike that the iron glue in which it has stuck the American economy has seeped far from the coasts and now entraps the Seventh District just as surely as it has gummed up the works throughout our Nation. Even beyond our shores this work stoppage is methodically entrapping our foreign trade and our whole foreign policy. Mr. Speaker, this is an intolerable strike.

But even more intolerable and even more incomprehensible is the total inability of the Federal Government to deal with this situation.

There can be no question but that this strike endangers America's national health and safety. It reached that lamentable point, yea these many months ago. The strike began in October, and the courts and the President found then that it threatened the Nation's health and safety.

The longshoremen were sent back to work under an 80-day Taft-Hartley injunction.

Then, in just about the worst of all possible Christmas presents, that in-

junction expired, and the Longshoremen's Union promptly quit work again.

And there we were. And there we still are; left high and dry with no further legislative remedies by which the courts, the President, or the Congress can do anything to end, even temporarily, a strike that is eating away at the very underpinnings of our economy and is undermining the very foundation upon which we have built our foreign policy.

If there is any doubt that our domestic economy is endangered, you have only to ask any businessman in any of our congressional districts who receives or ships anything at all via our intracoastal or transoceanic maritime routes. That businessman will tell you that his business is rotting just as the bananas are rotting inside the ships swinging silently at anchor in our gulf and Atlantic ports while the only longshoremen in sight pace a picket line.

If there is any doubt that our foreign policy is being threatened with extinction, one needs only hark back to the commitment of this Nation to the policy of dealing and trading with the Common Market of Europe in the hope of developing new prosperity from expanded world trade. There is no trade when ships cannot move into and out of our ports. Without trade the United States cannot possibly recoup through increased trade the advantages which we have bargained away to the Common Market trade area.

This strike is not intolerable, it is catastrophic.

The national concern here is no longer whether union and management are playing fair with themselves, but the obvious fact that the American people are not getting what another Missourian once called a Fair Deal.

The issues involved in this work stoppage are so serious that the President personally proposed that longshoremen return to work while union and management continue to negotiate the issues. Management accepted that plan. The leaders of the International Longshoremen's Association rejected it.

In the face of overwhelming proof of strike damage to the U.S. economy and world position these union leaders utterly refused to consider the needs of their Nation, or its people. They feel so powerful that they think they are safe in disregarding the bubbling discontent with this strike that is sweeping the Nation.

It is time for somebody to demand responsibility from the union. And it would be well for the Longshoremen's Union to bear in mind that if this union does not accept responsibility in the immediate future it will may provoke the American people to demand a readjustment of our laws that will take from the unions for all time the massive power they now enjoy.

It now appears to me that the somebody who demands responsibility from the Longshoremen is not going to be the President, even though he is a proved demander. It is, I suppose, too much for us to hope that the Nation's Chief Executive would jump up and down on union leaders as he did on steel industry execu-

tives. And, even if he did, the unionmen probably would not believe it coming from a man who voted against the Taft-Hartley law—which he has had to impose on numerous occasions since he became President. We had from the President yesterday only a halfhearted and belated call for a settlement—another committee to look into the mess, and so forth.

It appears that we in this House and this Congress are the ones who must rise up and be the demanders. We must demand now that the Longshoremen end their work stoppage, and accept the Government's proposal of continued work while settlement negotiations continue.

Let us remember that long ago this Nation's antitrust laws were imposed to protect the people from irresponsibility by management. Irresponsibility in a democracy is just as dangerous when used by workers as when used by management. I fear we have fallen into the fixing of wages intended as a floor. Let us not be similarly entrapped into fixing prices.

Big labor has come full circle from the 1930's when it won labor's charter of rights. Then, we had malefactors of great wealth, now we have a union situation in which there are malefactors of great power.

The longshoremen are asking for it. It appears that big labor—what Jimmy Hoffa calls the labor business—also is asking for it. And it refers to legislative action by this Congress to curb the monopoly power of labor. And this Congress can act with the firm and vocal backing of a great majority of the American people who are fed up with big labor's lack of concern with the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let us ponder well the possible consequences of the current situation in which individual union leaders have the power, apparent desire and ability and the contempt to actually halt all the transportation and/or shipping in this Nation—in spite of defense requirements. Teamsters Union President James Hoffa and President William V. Bradley of the International Longshoremen's Association hold that power today; as indeed they have threatened its use in the past.

Let us note that remedial legislation by this Congress could take several forms:

First. Some people are so disgusted that they have suggested that the right to strike itself be drastically regulated or even eliminated.

Second. Some want to have the Federal Government's machinery of intervention in strike situations greatly strengthened, even to the extent of allowing a court to issue a permanent antistrike injunction upon a finding that a strike threatens the public health and welfare.

Third. There have been suggestions that emergency dispute boards, set up by the Federal Government, be empowered to recommend settlement terms with Presidential backing in a long step toward compulsory arbitration.

Fourth. And it repeatedly has been suggested that big labor be brought under the laws of the Nation that prevent monopoly situations in management. Such a remedy would deal with the nationwide bargaining and industrywide strike power which in large measure gives labor leaders their ace card today.

The time for lamenting is past. The time for demanding is here. And if demands fall on deaf ears, the time for retaliation is near.

There are many reasons being advanced why no action can or should be taken to alleviate the labor situation now facing the Nation.

There is only one single, compelling reason to take action. It is that nothing less than the preservation of the basic national interests of the United States is at stake. This problem is the greatest domestic issue before the Nation at this hour.

The President has not seen fit to act with firmness.

The Congress alone is left to protect the rights of the citizens.

Let us be at it.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT STUDY OF THE MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS OF THE VARIOUS FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, today my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and I, have introduced similar resolutions calling for the creation of a select committee authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the management operations of various foreign assistance programs of the United States.

This committee, to be composed of 10 Members appointed by the Speaker, will be one having special knowledge of the fields to be studied by the committee.

We hope that by creation of such a select committee the Congress might better determine whether improvements can be made in the administration and management of various foreign assistance programs, including the Foreign Assistance Act, the Agricultural Trade Development Act, and the Peace Corps Act. It is also hoped that congressional oversight and guidance of the administration of U.S. policies involved in such programs might similarly be strengthened and improved.

Many complaints have always been heard among the Members of Congress each year when the foreign aid authorization and appropriation legislation reaches the House of Representatives for

debate and vote. The general dissatisfaction seemed to reach a new high during the 2d session of the 87th Congress. I believe many of the complaints are completely justified.

It seems clear that many Members of Congress feel that present procedures and practices in evaluating the administration and operation of the aid program, and in authorizing the aid programs and providing appropriations, are inadequate. Problems in these fields are ill considered and explored far too little under present practices.

The detailed study of this proposed committee will involve the oft-asked questions, "What are our foreign assistance programs?" "Where are their goals aimed?" "What alternative aims and objectives could be suggested?" "What positive and negative contributions do they make toward overall U.S. policies in the cold war?" "How can we improve the policies involved in submitting appropriations and legislation from the executive to Congress each year?" and "What better ways can we evaluate our programs, prevent duplication, encourage coordination, and eliminate malfunctions and unsound administrative procedures before they become a drain on the American taxpayer?" The answers to these questions now lie before a myriad of agencies, committees and individuals, with little idea as to proper concepts of authority and responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge upon my colleagues to support this resolution the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and I have introduced. It will not only assist our taxpayers, but it will improve the policies and procedures of American and free world interest, so vitally concerned at present with our faults in the field of foreign assistance programs. It is high time that we began using foreign assistance, properly planned and soundly administered, as a weapon in the cold war instead of a weapon against the best interests of American taxpayers.

The complete text of the resolution follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of ten Members of the House of Representatives, having special knowledge of the fields to be studied by the committee, to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the management operations of the various foreign assistance programs of the United States, including but not limited to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Agricultural Trade Development Assistance Act of 1954, and the Peace Corps Act, with a view to determining whether improvements can be made in the administration and management of the various programs, and improving congressional oversight and guidance over the administration of the United States policies involved in such programs. In carrying out such investigation and study

the committee shall give particular attention to the following:

(1) the methods and procedures followed in the executive departments and agencies in the formulation of policies to carry out the various assistance programs;

(2) the management problems involved in coordinating various assistance programs between the departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government;

(3) the methods and procedures followed by the executive departments and agencies in assuring that the various assistance programs are being conducted in adherence to a national policy;

(4) the methods and procedures followed under such programs to assure coordination of our foreign assistance activities with other nations and with international organizations;

(5) the methods and procedures followed by the executive departments and agencies in formulating and submitting legislative and appropriations requests relating to the assistance programs to the Congress; and

(6) the methods and procedures followed by the executive departments and agencies in reporting to Congress on the administration and accomplishments of the assistance programs.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable the results of its study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is also empowered to recruit and utilize, on a loan basis, appropriate experts, consultants, and technicians from the executive branch of the Government.

RESOLUTION TO INVENTORY THE FIELD OF FOREIGN AID

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], has in-

dicated, our purpose in introducing this resolution is to inventory the whole field of foreign aid, and to recommend continuance of sound programs, discontinuance of unsound programs, and overall coordination to minimize duplication and waste. We feel that foreign aid, if needed, must be administered to further American and free world policies here and abroad.

My colleague, the gentleman from California, Representative LIPSCOMB, is a member of both the Defense and State Department Subcommittees of the House Appropriation Committee. I am a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the same committee. We have long realized that the agencies and departments administering these programs have never had a unified, coordinated approach designed to eliminate as much as possible overlapping functions, poorly conceived programs, and conflicting policy goals.

The recent appointment of a Presidential Commission To Investigate Foreign Assistance is further evidence of the need for such an overall study. I feel that such an investigation should be comprehensive, not merely an examination of one or two aspects of foreign assistance, and that it should be made in Congress by Members of the branch of Government responsible for authorizing and appropriating the money. I will await with interest the findings of the Presidential Commission, but the responsibility of ending duplication, both in and out of Congress, and coordinating the activities of pertinent committees can only be carried out by Congress itself.

As I sat through day after day of hearings on foreign operations last session, I was more appalled than ever by examples of just plain silly things we have done. We have had television sets sent to African villages which lack electricity. We have raised the standard of living of some segments of foreign nations all out of proportion to that of the general populace.

While the administration may view sending these television sets as an isolated example, my experience has convinced me that these instances are more the rule than the exception and that they are results of overall duplication and lack of planning coordination among our foreign assistance programs. It was only last year that I discovered through questioning of witnesses that the United States has for many years paid its subscription to the Inter-American Development Bank only to have the bank reinvest the unneeded portion of this payment in U.S. securities—at a cost of over \$2.4 million to American taxpayers in interest payments.

Mr. Speaker, the trouble is that we only find these things out after the fact, and never in time to correct the situation for the benefit of our citizens. It is high time that we reviewed our entire foreign assistance program with a view to examining closely the areas previously mentioned by my colleague from California.

At present, there is no single committee charged with the responsibility and given the authority to determine and evaluate first, Executive formulation of policies to carry out these programs; second, problems in coordinating programs between a number of departments and agencies; third, procedures to conduct these assistance programs in adherence to a national policy; fourth, methods to assure coordination of these activities with other nations and with international organizations; fifth, ways of formulating and submitting appropriations and legislative requests to Congress; and, sixth, procedures followed to inform the American people and Congress as to the need for and accomplishments of the assistance program.

As one of the Members who has supported sound concepts of foreign assistance, and who has consistently fought waste and inefficiency, I urge the Members of this body to adopt this resolution we have today introduced.

FEDERAL PAY ADJUSTMENT LAW

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], is recuperating from surgery in satisfactory manner, and we are all happy with this news.

Before he entered the hospital, he had requested that certain legislation be drafted for his introduction. This legislation would give a measure of relief to certain Federal employees who were discriminated against in the Federal pay adjustment law passed in the last Congress.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], who is one of the very good friends of the Federal employee in this Congress, was most interested in having this legislation introduced at the earliest possible moment so that it could be started on the way toward consideration. Unfortunately, his surgery will require his absence for as long as 30 days for full recovery, and this would delay consideration of this new bill for that long.

Therefore, I am introducing this new bill today for JOEL. While it will bear my name, it should certainly be considered a Broyhill bill. It was drawn at his instigation, and I am introducing it only because of his absence and because I know he would want it presented as soon as possible so that the Federal employees who were adversely affected by the pay adjustments last year will receive consideration as soon as possible.

I might add that I am in complete sympathy with this legislation. There are a number of employees in my district who have written me about the inequities in the new law, and I certainly want to see some consideration given to their situation.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, having just heard the President's budget message, I would like to say to my colleagues that I am deeply disturbed to note that the President has requested Congress to extend again the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles for another fiscal year. I simply cannot understand how the President can come up here on Monday and call for a \$13.5 billion tax cut and the revision of harmful tax inequities, and then on Thursday, send up a budget message asking us to continue an unequal, depressive tax imposed on a segment of the economy that affects the jobs of one out of seven employees, and accounts for \$1 out of \$5 spent in retail trade.

As I view it, the outright repeal of this 10 percent automobile excise tax is the first step toward the implementation of the goals the President wants. But if total repeal is too much of a revision all at once, the very least we could do is to let the tax revert to 7 percent—the rate in effect before the emergency increase during the Korean war. This would cause a temporary loss of approximately one-third of the annual revenue collected under the 10-percent rate, or about \$400 million. Further, just as the President has pointed out, such a tax reduction would stimulate business activity and generate tax revenues that would recoup in a substantial measure this loss of income. I urge we review this matter carefully before we blindly acquiesce in extending this tax as the President has requested.

THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Members have heard the announcement of the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union group next Monday. I would say to the new Members on both sides of the aisle that this is the granddaddy of all the foreign junketing organizations. If you are interested this year, an off-election year, in taking a junket to some foreign country, that meeting is the place to be next Monday. Go over and see how it is done.

PROPOSED MIDSESSION BUDGET UPDATING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Lincoln said:

If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it.

Today the President has submitted the coordinated Executive budget. From now on the processing procedure is uncoordinated and fragmented. Occasionally a revenue measure—involving only a fraction of total Treasury receipts—is processed. Legislation for new programs is being processed—at times at variance with the budget amounts. Maybe back-door spending bills are moving.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the economic forces are ever changing, either confirming the January assumptions as to budget revenues, or disclosing where and to what extent they appear out of tune.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that last January we applauded the President's message of a balanced budget only to learn after election that a deficit of \$7.8 billion placed further burden on the American people. I shall have more to say about this later.

Many do not realize, and I feel it should be made crystal clear, that expenditure trends in the current year may be at variance with the budget assumptions. Approximately one-third of annual expenditures are from prior appropriations and thus not directly affected by current action on the appropriation bills.

Under present law and procedure no congressional mechanism exists to render a complete "stop, look, and listen" status report while all of these things are taking place. Congress does not know "where it is" nor "whither it is tending."

Responsible legislators seeking to establish sound fiscal policies for our Government are left groping in the dark.

In the past, the Joint Taxation Committee has put out a staff estimate of receipts and expenditures in the spring of the year. This has been good and somewhat helpful. But, it is a gratuitous report and not required. It is highly sketchy, in fact little more than bare bones figures with little articulation of the meaningful budgetary happenings.

As I have said, a budget review is put out by the Executive several weeks after Congress finally adjourns; while it updates the figures it is in one sense merely a scorecard accounting of what Congress did to the budget. And, as we have seen, it comes too late to affect the situation, or to correct fiscal policies.

Referring once again to our experience in 1962, you will recall that the so-called midyear budget review was issued in mid-November, and constituted the first admission by the administration that we would have a \$7.8 billion deficit in the current fiscal year rather than the \$458

million surplus predicted in the annual budget message. Much of the difference was not a result of congressional action or inaction, but of the fact that the President's January assumptions regarding Federal revenue were unrealistic. Actual income fell far short of his prediction. The country would have been alerted to this fact and both the administration and the Congress could have guided themselves accordingly had a May 20 budget summary pointed up the failure of the economy to produce the hoped-for revenues.

In an attempt to bring some light out of the darkness so that we might see "where we are and whither we are tending" I am introducing today a bill to require a midsession budget updating and I shall include with these remarks a copy of the proposed legislation.

May I say in all candor a midsession Presidential updating of the January budget would probably be heavily burdened with political considerations, but so is every budget. It might contain some tongue-in-cheek statements.

It might stoutly maintain certain positions generally thought to be unrealistic under given circumstances, but that would be nothing new.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that Members will ask, "What good will it do after the House has processed several of the appropriation bills?" I would answer "We would have more current awareness of the fiscal situation and outlook and this affords basis to better judge what to do, and how to do it. Disposition of legislative bills for new programs, not just the appropriation bills, could be influenced."

I would further say up-to-date information could be useful in conference dealing with the Senate which historically raises the appropriation above the House.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that under the provisions of the bill the date of submission of the midsession updating is between May 1 and May 20. The object here is to set a date late enough that at least tentative readings on April 15 tax collections would be available.

Normally several appropriation bills and other financially significant bills are still to be reported. Most appropriation conferences are still to come. Many legislative bills are not completed.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me, and I am sure many Members on both sides of the aisle and both ends of the Capitol agree, the hour is late and time for sound fiscal policies of our Government is long past due. We need information, current information, if we stand up to our responsibilities. Let us again place the safeguard against big spending where it belongs—in the Congress. I ask all Members to reread article I, section 9 of the Constitution of the United States:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriation made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

Unless we have full and complete accounting we cannot follow faithfully this constitutional mandate.

I ask for prompt and bipartisan support of the bill I have introduced and have asked that it be printed in full in the *RECORD* following these remarks.

May I say further that the budget message from the President just read today confirms the need for this legislation. May I read a part of the message:

To meet our financial requirements and to provide a margin of flexibility, I will request a further increase in the debt limit for fiscal 1964. The exact amount and nature of the increase required depends not only on the total amount of the deficit but also on the particular time pattern of receipts and expenditures. For this reason, the debt limit to be requested for fiscal year 1964 will be determined later this year when a more reliable estimate can be made of the requirements.

Under the President's own statement he should come in with a budget message giving us some idea of what the income would be on which he bases his request for appropriations, and that should be between May 1 and May 20, when the tax collections will have been in, and we will be able to take a look, and not have the situation that developed last year, when it was stated that there would be a surplus, and then not until after the elections in November did we find we had a very substantial deficit facing the American people.

It seems to me in connection with this question of spending and the responsibility for spending, many talk about the spendthrift administration, but the responsibility for spending this money lies right here in the House of Representatives and in the body on the other side of the Capitol. If we are to have to be responsible, if we are to be fiscally responsible in this country, it must be done by those of us who have been sent here by the people of the country. I am very fearful, and I have read this budget carefully since it was delivered to us yesterday, of what this is going to do to the Nation.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] on the very clear statement he has made. I would like to call the attention of not only the Republicans in this Congress but also of the Democrats to the fact which you mentioned earlier in your address that "from now on the processing procedure will be uncoordinated and fragmented." It has seemed to me that we do not have a full view of everything that our Government is doing and a full view of everything that is being done in a given field when a proposal is before us. In other words, we do not get a sufficiently complete view of everything the Government is doing in a given field by private bodies in this country where all of the revenue has to come out of the common purse of the United States. I sometimes think

that on every proposal that comes before the Congress there ought to be a prelude or preface to it which outlines everything what is now being done in any given field. I recall a Member of the other body—a Democrat from the gentleman's Midwest—speaking out in criticism of the proposal for a domestic Peace Corps when he pointed out the fact that our churches and a lot of our civic bodies and our service clubs and other groups are already very active in that field. Any costs they incur must necessarily come from the common purse the same source that Federal revenue comes from. That sort of thing ought to be considered before we embark upon a new program involving Federal expenditures.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman, I think, agrees with me. Certainly, before we embark upon these things, we ought to know whither we are going and how much it will involve and we ought to stop, look, and listen. We all know that there are many things that we would like to have, but we cannot afford them.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman for proposing what I think is a great constructive idea to assist in a most confused area. I hope I may also make a suggestion which might be of some help. The budget, as submitted by the President today, if fully adopted by the Congress, would result, at a time what the President himself calls a period of general prosperity, in one of our largest peacetime deficits. It is in direct contradiction to the President's pledge to the American people that he has made on numerous occasions that his administration will—and I quote—"balance the budget over the years of the economic cycle."

The proposed deficit of \$11.9 billion would follow an estimated deficit of \$8.8 billion for the fiscal year 1963 which, in turn, followed a deficit of \$6.4 billion in fiscal year 1962 and a deficit of \$3.8 billion in the fiscal year 1961. The period represented by these four budgets closely approximates one complete economic cycle from the peak of the recovery after the 1958-59 recession to what is expected to be the peak of recovery following the 1960-61 recession. The proposed deficit in a time of economic prosperity would result largely from the President's proposal that we spend \$98.8 billion in fiscal year 1964, more than has ever been spent in any year of our history either in peace or in war. That expenditure would represent an increase, during the 4 fiscal years since 1961, of over \$17 billion in our annual rate of spending. It would bring the total deficit for the period to \$31 billion, representing 10 percent of the total national debt.

The President's budget can only be termed a radical proposal.

It is radical in the sense that it contravenes generally accepted economic theory that, while budget deficits during downturns may be stimulating, they should be followed by budget surpluses in times of prosperity.

It is radical in the sense that it rejects the administration's own policy of bal-

ancing the budget over the years of the economic cycle.

It is radical in its call for a heavy increase in expenditures at a time when a tax reduction has been called the primary goal of the Government.

Let me suggest that with the submission of this kind of budget Congress must assume a special responsibility.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman agrees with me, I am sure, that constitutionally it is our responsibility.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Absolutely, but I think we have not carried out that responsibility as we should, and I think this budget requires that Congress assume its full responsibility. It must consider the budget as a whole before it takes action on its parts. It must look at the effect on the economy of the revenues, expenditures, and deficit proposed. It must arrive at some sort of consensus. It must formulate some overall guide which will serve the Congress as it considers separately the revenue and appropriation bills which will constitute Congressional action on the overall budget.

For this reason, I am today writing to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, and the Senate Finance Committee, and the Senate Appropriations Committee, urgently requesting that these committees proceed with the consideration of a legislative budget as is required by section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act. This law is on the statute books and it directs the full committees or subcommittees thereof to consider the President's budget recommendations and report to their respective Houses a legislative budget, including estimated overall receipts and expenditures by February 15. That is what the law says. We have not been doing it. We have not been carrying out our responsibility.

I am suggesting that this can be most expeditiously accomplished by a subcommittee of these four committees consisting of members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which is composed of the senior members of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, and a similar group of members from the two Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

I am further requesting that the chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation call a meeting of that committee for the purpose of initiating action on this proposal by inviting the chairmen of the two Appropriations Committees to appoint members of their committees to serve on the budget committee.

I think that the requirements today, as the gentleman has pointed out, necessitate congressional action, and the least we can do is comply with the law with respect to the handling of the President's budget and what we should do in this field.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and now yield to the

gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. I have been reading with some interest the speeches of Candidate Kennedy on fiscal affairs. If you can find anything in this book of the speeches of Candidate Kennedy that is anywhere near comparable to what the action has been of President Kennedy, you will have to search a long, long time. Candidate Kennedy was for balancing the budget and cutting the number of employees placed upon the Federal payroll, and not to increase the national debt or interest on the national debt; but the actions that he and his administration have taken are exactly opposite to what he proposed as candidate for the high office of the Presidency of the United States.

I think it is high time the American people understand it. Either he did not understand the problems when he was a candidate for this high office, or did not have full information about them, but certainly his actions since he has assumed the responsibility do not square with his statements as a candidate. It seems to me that we in this Congress have a very deep responsibility to generations yet unborn, because they are going to be faced with the responsibility of paying off this debt. You cannot just laugh it off; sometime somebody is going to have to face up to the responsibility of paying it. We legislators must face up to this, for they are continuing to build up expenditures.

Just about a year ago President Kennedy said:

I would not hesitate to recommend an increase in taxes if it is necessary to balance the budget.

One year later we are coming in here now with a proposed tax reduction coupled with an increase in the budget. I do not believe that the rules of arithmetic have been repealed, as far as I know, and I think it is about time that we call a halt to this reckless spending and slow it up.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Michigan, and I repeat that the sole responsibility for the fiscal health of this country lies in this body and the body at the other end of the Capitol. Under the Constitution we have the power to do that, but in order to do the job we have got to have tools, we have got to have the information that is required for us to form our judgment.

I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the gentleman for introducing the bill which he has just explained. I feel that such a proposition as is proposed in his bill will save possibly billions of dollars.

The gentleman is a very important member of the Committee on Appropriations. It has been my pleasure to serve on a committee with the gentleman for

a number of years. He is a sound, deep thinker, and I join him and other Members of this Congress in doing my level best to see to it that our Government is a frugal government, that it will stand out in the history of this world as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

There is only one way to stop misery, distress, and everything that is bad in this world, and that is by stopping the spending of the people's money as recklessly and as wastefully as we have in past years.

As the gentleman knows, I made a speech on last Thursday pointing out the pitfalls which lie ahead and which every nation in the world has suffered that has traveled the full length of the spending road on which we have traveled at breakneck speed for nigh on to three decades.

You will find misery, strife, hunger, and cold wars in most every one of those nations across the seas that has followed the spending and waste theory to the end of the road.

So I shall be with the gentleman every step of the way and with every Member, regardless of party, who is determined to save this country from national bankruptcy and personal bankruptcy, misery, and strife.

Mr. BOW. As the gentleman understands, this bill I hope will have bipartisan support. It is not politically motivated. It is simply to give the House of Representatives and the Senate an opportunity to review the budget that came up today, which admittedly by the President's own message, we do not have the figures or the information upon which we can intelligently appropriate in the future.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to associate myself with his study, and I certainly will do anything I can to assist in getting the fiscal considerations of our country back to where they belong under the Constitution.

I appreciate the remarks of the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Through his courtesy I was given the opportunity to see the budget and some extracts therefrom.

As proof of what the gentleman in the well stated, I would call attention to the fact this is a hoax about the billion-dollar savings in agriculture. You cannot save while adding 36,000 people to the public payroll.

By analyzing the President's own message, on page 10 you can figure three different ways whether the deficit is going to be from \$5 to \$6 million and more, or 13.6. The central figure of \$11.9 billion deficit attached to the \$15 billion deficit of the first 2 years of this administration is enough to bring forcibly to the attention of anyone that we must fear drastic inflation which is

undercutting the savings, as we are told, of those we try to honor most in this Nation—the senior citizens.

After having been presented today the most inconsistent budget ever submitted by a President, may I say it is not a question of "Alice in Wonderland" but "Jack in Wonderland."

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to revise and extend my remarks and include a news release that I already have sent to the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL's news release is as follows:

Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri, today called President Kennedy's budget proposals to the Congress "utter fiscal insanity of a Jack in Wonderland" in the following news release:

"The President first tells us that tax reduction is the first order of business and that with defense and space expenses going up he was 'obliged to limit severely 1964 expenditures' in the domestic and civilian fields. And then, 3 days later he sends the Congress a budget listing increased expenditures for all these domestic programs: 'Natural resources, commerce and transportation, health, labor and welfare, education and that elusive topic—general government.'

"Also, quite aside from defense and space plans, he again conveniently forgets his promise to the American people and asks for increased funds to be spent by all these Federal organizations: The Defense Department's civil programs, the judiciary, his Executive Office of the President, the Commerce Department, the Department of HEW, the Department of Interior, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, the Treasury Department, the Federal Aviation Agency, General Services Administration, District of Columbia and that fine category 'allowances, undistributed.'

"It also is interesting to see that in his rush to hold down domestic expenditures Mr. Kennedy has found it helpful to call for an increase in the number of Federal employees in these organizations under his control:

"Executive Office of the President, Agriculture, Commerce, Defense Department civil programs, HEW, Interior, Justice, Labor, Post Office, State, Peace Corps, Treasury, Atomic Energy Commission, Federal Aviation Agency, General Services Administration, U.S. Information Agency, and again that catchall category of 'miscellaneous independent agencies.'

"After making all these requests, the President is naive enough to indicate that most if not all of the increases in these programs will be offset domestically by an expected cut in expenses for his farm program. Oddly enough, no farm program in 30 years ever has saved as much money as any President ever claimed it would.

"Most farm programs somehow end up costing the taxpayers more dollars. This is totally false and inadequate basis upon which to build American hopes that domestic expenses will be about the same in fiscal 1964 as in fiscal 1963.

"But certainly the New Frontier brain trusters and ghostwriters like Heller and Sorensen have not left their President out on such a wildly drooping limb without a new fiscal concept to explain it all. In fact, Mr. Kennedy has given us our choice of three ways to explain the added debt that his programs will place on Americans.

"All that needs to be noted is that each of the three ways winds up with a red ink

total. You may take your choice of whether the United States is to go into the hole an additional \$11.9 billion, \$10.3 billion, or \$7.6 billion. That should make everybody feel better.

"If the budget is approved in this form, it will mean a \$26 billion deficit over the first 3 years of the New Frontier. The inflationary aspects of this trend should shock the American people.

"And despite his talk of tax reduction, the President also slipped into his budget message a short paragraph or two about the increased taxes he will ask for, including a user charge for taxpayers who use the public airways and the public inland waterways.

"Among the dozens of irresponsible programs hinted at in this message he also tells us these things:

"1. He is for more contributions to the economic development overseas of less privileged independent peoples. I wonder if he considers the Communist-oppressed people of Poland to be independent. If so, must we anticipate a drive to send U.S. tax dollars to Hungary and the Ukraine and Red China?

"2. He will use the Trade Expansion Act to expand foreign markets for our farm products. That will be a bitter reference for poultry farmers who already are finding curtailment in their European sales as the Common Market methodically slaps on 'variable levies' to keep our farm products out.

"3. The food stamp plan will be continued. That will be good news for the Democratic Congressmen whose districts are benefiting from this program as a party slush fund as I vigorously pointed out last year. That won't help the rest of the country one iota.

"4. Health insurance for the aging will be sought, not only under social security but for everybody else out of general revenues. Medicare was enough of an insult to the people. Now he wants 'omnicare.' That is socialism.

"5. Pay hikes will be sought for Federal department and agency heads and their deputies. Mr. Kennedy appoints those persons on a political basis."

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. In his state of the Union message the President said that many desirable programs must be reduced or postponed. Does the gentleman know—or can we determine—what these programs are that we are postponing because of lack of money?

Mr. BOW. I will say to the gentleman that I heard the President make that statement and reread the budget message and found that a most interesting paragraph, and I shall take it with me to every appropriation hearing that I sit in on.

(The joint resolution previously referred to reads as follows:)

H.J. Res. 129

Joint resolution amending the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended (31 U.S.C. 11-24), is further amended by adding the following new section:

SEC. 218. (a) Not earlier than May 1 nor later than May 20 of each year, the President shall transmit to Congress, in such form and detail as he may determine, such revisions of estimates and summary data contained in the last annual Budget and

subsequent amendments thereto as may be necessary to update the Budget in the light of then existing conditions.

(b) These revisions shall include, as a minimum—

(1) estimated receipts and expenditures, and actual or proposed appropriations or other obligational authority of the Government during the fiscal year in progress;

(2) estimated receipts of the Government during the ensuing fiscal year under laws then existing and also under the revenue proposals, if any, contained in the Budget or otherwise recommended to the Congress by the President;

(3) estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations or other obligational authority necessary in the judgment of the President for the support of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year;

(4) balanced statements of the condition of the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year in progress and at the end of the ensuing fiscal year if the financial proposals contained in the Budget or otherwise recommended to the Congress by the President are adopted; and

(5) the estimated effect, if any, of legislation adopted or pending adoption in the current session of the Congress on such estimates and summary data, to the extent necessary to more complete disclosure of the prospective condition of the Treasury.

(c) Revisions transmitted pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be accompanied by (1) such statements as are necessary to disclose the bases and reasons for such revisions and (2) recommendations for any legislative actions that, in the judgment of the President, should be taken in the circumstances.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF MERIT FOR THE HUMANITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman proceeds, I should like to say that by prearrangement I agreed to yield with the hope and with the belief that the gentleman from Missouri, who is my very good friend and neighbor, has something of great worth to share with us, and it is appropriate, I think, after the remarks we just heard, that they be heard at this time, so I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND MESSAGE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we live in the day of the superlative. Everything is bigger and better—or bigger and worse—and relatively more or less impressive or progressive than anything in its respective category that has ever come or gone down the echoing corridors of time and eternity. And today's budget is no exception to the rule.

In many respects this is the most portentous message the President plans to send down this year. I have listened to messages from Presidents here in the House for 40 years, but in all that time

I have never seen or heard a budget message like this one, and neither have you; nor has anyone else.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE BUDGET

This budget is the recordbreaker of all the succession of recordbreaking budgets of the last 10 years.

It is the largest expenditure budget since 1789—it proposes to spend \$98,802,000,000. That tops the peak of World War II spending by \$500,000,000 when the sky was the limit and survival the sole object. And it tops the current year's estimated level by \$4,491,000,000, and billions above earlier budgets. And as I shall shortly document, much of it is for nondefense purposes. Even with the tax revisions, it proposes to take more from the people than in any year since 1789, war or peace—the sum of \$86,900,000,000 in 1964 or \$1,400,000,000 higher than now estimated for fiscal 1963.

And even though it anticipates record national revenues, they fall far short of meeting the expenditures urged in the budget. Only once before—in fiscal 1959—has the budget in peacetime exceeded the \$11,902,000,000 deficit shown in this budget. And impressions to the contrary, more than \$6,600,000,000 of that tentative deficit figure cannot be ascribed to loss through tax cuts or revisions or national defense spending increases. Nor will rising space and interest expenditures account for it. Nondefense spending beyond available revenues is heavily involved. Details in substantiation follow.

And, Mr. Speaker, this \$11,902,000,000 deficit is so tenuous, so precarious, so uncertain that the President plans to wait until later this year to advise the House how much he will have to ask in the way of a higher debt ceiling. But he concedes the obvious—the present ceiling for fiscal 1963 must be promptly hiked and a much further enlargement provided for fiscal 1964.

But using the tentative, the deficit estimate of \$11,902,000,000 for 1964, following as it does an \$8,811,000,000 deficit in the current year, and a \$6,378,000,000 deficit in fiscal 1962, would add to the staggering sum of \$27,091,000,000 of red-ink spending in 3 years. And that follows deficits of \$21,953,000,000 in the previous 8 years for the shocking total of \$49,044,000,000 since the war ended in Korea.

Ah, but you say we have had to defend the country; we have had to build our defenses; modernize; supply our forces with missiles and Polaris submarines. And, of course, national defense expenditures have been high—including documented widespread waste and some other questionable items. Let me cite a few figures taken from the budgets.

This 1964 budget proposes spending of \$4,491 million above 1963—and \$2,062 million of the increase is for other than national defense, a 5-percent increase.

This 1964 budget proposes spending of \$17,287 million above 1961—and \$9,348 million of the increase is for other than national defense, a 27-percent increase.

This 1964 budget proposes spending of \$31,265 million above the year following

Korea, fiscal year 1954—and \$22,818 million of the increase is for other than national defense, an increase of 111 percent for nondefense, as contrasted with 18-percent increase for national defense items.

So, Mr. Speaker, no matter what the philosophy, no matter what the merits of these ever-rising nondefense budgets, it is beyond dispute that we have been spending more and more and more for nondefense things and loading the cost onto future generations. Refusing, in time of successively recordbreaking years of economic activity and national revenues, to either pay as we go along or do without or defer some projects until we are—if we ever are—willing to pay for them.

If there is the slightest hope in the message or the budget today that the budget will be balanced even in fiscal 1965, there is no documentation to sustain it. On the contrary, there are abundant indications of another heavy deficit in 1965—and inevitably the debt must go higher and higher.

Today's press quotes the Secretary of the Treasury as saying that not only will there be another deficit in 1965, but very possibly in 1966. Incredible. Unbelievable.

Nothing seems to be so permanent as temporary increases in the national debt ceiling.

The size and direction of this budget—following the excessive appropriations of the past—indicate beyond question that if adopted you gentlemen will have to secure reelection to subsequent Congresses before you see even the faintest hope of a budget balance. Secretary Dillon confirms it today. Or any reduction of the debt.

This budget calls on Congress, at this session, to approve an appropriation or new obligatory budget of \$107,927,000,000 for fiscal 1964. A defense budget. A peacetime budget. The second peacetime year in which the asking price crosses the \$100,000,000,000 mark. More than half of the increase over last year is for nondefense and in the same budget estimating a deficit at \$11,902,000,000.

This budget proposes imposition of new taxes. And another extension of Korean war taxes.

If this budget is adopted, the public debt, according to the tentative estimate today, will reach a new alltime high—\$315,604,000,000—billions above any figure ever before contemplated. You will be asked to again extend, and of course raise, the present limit of \$308,000,000,000. A mere gesture. We need a limit on Federal expenditures more than we need a limit on the national debt.

With these ever-increasing deficits and debts and decline in the value of the dollar, who is to say that European bankers, holding more claims against our shrunken and dwindling gold supply, will not resume their demands of the last 5 years when \$6,802,000,000 in gold left Fort Knox? Since we convened here on the floor a year ago, our gold supply has dropped \$910,000,000.

Since we convened here a year ago, the purchasing power of the dollar fell to a new low. Savings, pensions, life insurance, bonds will buy less.

Since we convened here a year ago, the cost-of-living price index hit a new high 6 times.

Since we convened here a year ago, despite record national business activity as measured by virtually every significant indicator, we spent ourselves deeper in debt. The inevitable limit is just that much closer. Khrushchev is waiting. And you cannot lay the blame at the door of defense and security. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]—an authority on the subject—told you here on the floor last April:

We should not give ourselves an opiate and lay all our problems at the door of defense spending.

At the heart of our national finances is a simple, inescapable fact, easily grasped by anyone. It is that our Government—any government—like individuals and families—cannot spend and continue to spend more than they take in without inviting disaster. With governments, continued deficit spending inevitably leads to debasement of currency. A dollar is only as valuable and reliable in the eyes of others as it is to us.

BUDGETARY OVEROPTIMISM

It has become traditional—and perhaps only natural—that budgets from the executive branch are almost always optimistic as to revenue and conservative as to expenditures. The budget balance or unbalance is prospectively and optimistically arrived at; it rests on contingencies and demonstrated uncertainties. And it too frequently violates in the name of urgent national necessity elementary business prudence by failing to allow clear margins as a hedge against overoptimism and for unforeseen national emergencies.

So, Mr. Speaker, the first thing to keep in mind as the committees and the House process this budget—both sides of it—is not to accept it at face value. It will not turn out the same. It never does. This one is evidently so tenuous that the President says he will wait until later in the year to specify the amount of the additional debt ceiling. And more often than not, the final result is for the worse, not the better. If the original January budgets for the last 9 fiscal years, 1955 through 1963, had held, there would have been a \$3,600,000,000 surplus to apply against the national debt. Instead, we went \$33,900,000,000 deeper in the red—the original marks were missed by \$37,500,000,000. In 6 of the 9 years, revenues fell short of original estimates, and in 6 of the 9 years, expenditures exceeded original estimates. So for purposes of deciding what to do in the processing of this budget, we can all agree it would be wiser to presume a change for the worse rather than the better, and act accordingly.

They were feasting on the delights of sweet anticipation, but now we are gnawing on the cold cornucopia of stern reality.

In summary, here is the situation:

Variations from original budget predictions (using the last 9 budgets, 1955-63)

Revenues:	
Original January budget predictions.....	\$673,400,000,000
Final results.....	657,500,000,000
Revenues fell short by.....	15,900,000,000
NOTE.—In 6 of the 9 years, revenues were less than the original budget; 3 were more.	
Expenditures:	
Original January budget predictions.....	669,800,000,000
Final results.....	691,400,000,000
Expenditures went higher by.....	21,600,000,000
NOTE.—In 6 of the 9 years, spending exceeded the original budget. In 3 years, it was less.	
So, in total, there was a deviation of.....	37,500,000,000
Surplus (+) or deficit (—):	
Original budget predictions.....	+3,600,000,000
Final results.....	-33,900,000,000
So, in total, instead of a surplus of \$3.6 billion over the 9 years as originally predicted, there was a deficit of \$33.9 billion—a change for the worse of.....	37,500,000,000
NOTE.—Figures for 1963 "final result" are taken from 1964 budget and therefore are subject to adjustment, but not enough to distort the end result.	
Source: Budget documents.	

ANALYSIS OF THE PROJECTED 1964 DEFICIT OF \$11,902,000,000

Mr. Speaker, a feature of this budget is the alarming size of the deficit—\$11,902,000,000. The committees, the House and the country ought especially to know why so large a part is written in red ink. Only once before in our peacetime history have we faced such a deficit. And it follows on the heels of an \$8,811,000,000 deficit predicted in this budget for the current year. And that follows a \$6,378,000,000 deficit last year, fiscal 1962.

That adds up to \$27,091,000,000 in the red in the three fiscal years, 1962-64. And that exceeds the budgetary failure of the previous 8 peacetime years of \$21,953,000,000. It writes another chapter to an already sorry record of refusal to live within national income or at least defer other than necessities until we are willing and able to pay for them. A little national self-discipline. Imagine, 28 deficits in the last 34 years, through wars; through peace; through unprecedented national prosperity and maximum national revenues.

But what about this monstrous deficit of \$11,902,000,000 urged in the budget for 1964? Is it accounted for by loss of

revenues under the President's tax reduction and revisions? Is it accounted for by the suggested speed-up in corporation tax payments—a shift, of course, that would not alter ultimate total collections? Do rising national defense costs explain it? Is it incident to increased propositions for space conquest? Is it the result of higher interest costs on the ever-growing national debt? Is it first year costs—and the first year is often the lowest—of new nondefense programs urged in the budget?

No, Mr. Speaker, combine all these—accept them for the sake of analytical computation—and you still cannot account for the \$11,902,000,000 deficit urged upon the House. Substantial deficits remain. Due to what? Spending for nondefense activities already underway—and in excess of alltime record national revenues. Refusing to retrench expenditures to bring them within the limit of the funds at hand. Proposing new programs—on borrowed money. Hiking the national debt to a new alltime high and thereby moving closer to the inevitable consequences. Here are the dimensions of today's message:

Analysis of President's projected 1964 budget deficit of \$11,902,000,000

1. Budget deficit for fiscal 1964 (starting July 1, 1963) as projected by the President, Jan. 17, 1963 (as with every budget, it rests on a number of assumptions and contingencies).....	\$11,902,000,000
2. Eliminate fiscal 1964 budgetary effect (net estimated loss of revenue) of President's tax reduction and revision proposals and proposed new transportation user taxes:	
(a) Tax reduction and revisions.....	-5,300,000,000
(b) Speedup of collection of corporation taxes and initial stimulus from tax proposals if adopted.....	+2,600,000,000
(c) New transportation user taxes.....	-100,000,000
Deficit remaining.....	-9,102,000,000
3. Eliminate projected fiscal 1964 budget expenditure increases for national defense purposes (the estimated increases over 1963). (NOTE.—Includes \$885,000,000 applicable to military pay increase proposed in budget as new legislation).....	-2,420,000,000
Deficit remaining.....	-6,673,000,000
4. This remaining deficit projection divides as follows:	
(a) 1964 budget expenditure effect of proposals for new legislation. First year is after the smallest. (1964 budget request for new obligating authority in 1964 for these is \$1,827,468,000).....	317,845,000
(b) 1964 budget expenditure increases for space and interest on the debt (the estimated increases over 1963). (These items also emphasized in state of Union message):	
(1) Space (NASA).....	1,800,000,000
(2) Interest on debt.....	320,000,000
(c) All other purposes.....	4,235,155,000
Deficit remaining.....	-6,673,000,000

NOTE.—1964 budget also assumes extension of certain excises for another year—now due to expire or decline June 30, 1963, and extension of 52 percent corporate tax rate to Dec. 31, 1963. Principal economic assumptions affecting revenues are a \$578,000,000,000 gross national product; \$439,000,000,000 personal income; corporation profits before taxes, \$53,000,000,000.

Source: 1964 budget.

All protestations, all rationalizations, all plausible economic and fiscal theories

aside, deficits are by historical fact becoming a way of life—uninterrupted by

the upward direction in this budget. Once again no provision of a systematic and methodical liquidation of the national debt—not even a nominal beginning is suggested or in sight.

There ought to be in every government, a perpetual, anxious, and unceasing effort to reduce that debt which at any time exists, as fast as shall be practicable, consistently with integrity and good faith.

Somewhere in the sprawling bureaucracy there may be a recognition of the need to control—that is the word used, as distinguished from reduce—expenditures but we challenge anyone to find reductions significantly manifested either in last year's appropriations or in the budget today. Turn to the budget book itself and leaf through, page by page, item by item, and see the surprising number of increases over the last budget—hundreds of them. Nondefense items. Then compare the number of reductions—comparative handfuls. Either we ought to do without or should be financially responsible enough to pay for them as we go. Cut out the frills and the furbelows. That is the minimum demanded by commonsense, and especially so with a staggering, and increasing, national debt hanging heavily over our heads.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. Speaker, some confusion persists about the nondefense expenditures in today's budget. We have demonstrated time and again—and the House, the press, and the country are more and more aware—that it is the ever-rising nondefense items that have unbalanced the budgets of the last 10 years. In view of the reports and the confusion, especially the comparison of next year with the current year, let us once again nail down the unvarnished facts, in unmistakable terms, with unassailable budget figures, corroborated by unimpeachable authority. We need to know this. The press needs to know it. The country needs to know it.

Expenditures recommended in the budget today for fiscal year 1964 for other than national defense are higher than now shown in the budget for the current year 1963. Let me repeat—nonnational defense expenditures for 1964 in this budget exceed those of the current year by \$2,062 million.

This is the consistent pattern of the last 10 budgets. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] gave you the facts last April when he presented the defense appropriation bill here on the floor. He is an authority on the matter of what is in the budgets for national defense and by the same rule an authority on what is not down for national defense. Let us bring his figures down to date:

There is a tendency on the part of many Americans in and out of Government to feel, more or less, that high taxes, big Government spending and the increase in the ceiling on the national debt are the result of defense spending.

That is not correct. We should not give ourselves an opiate and lay all our problems at the door of defense spending.

The gentleman from Texas substantiated his statement by citing the level of

change for the 8 years from fiscal year 1954—the first year after Korea—through fiscal 1961. National defense spending increased only 1 percent but nondefense spending increased 65 percent.

In further substantiation, he continues:

If you project this through fiscal year 1963, which will begin on July 1, 1962, you will find again, according to the budget estimates, that through that period the increase in defense spending will be 12 percent above 1954 and nondefense spending will be 94 percent above nondefense spending in 1954.

There, Mr. Speaker, is the unvarnished fact, in unmistakable terms, using unsailable figures, by an unimpeachable authority. And there lies the genesis of much of our tenuous fiscal situation. There is the place—had we exercised self-restraint—where we could have held the line. But we refused—repeatedly. And that is a primary reason the debt has risen every year—we insisted on including nondefense items for which we could not pay. And in the budget today, with its hundreds of requests for increased appropriations—at a cost beyond what they can expect to take in—there are no reassuring signs of any disposition to reverse the trend. More and more—and borrowing to make up the difference.

Specifically, this budget proposes to spend \$43,369,000,000 in fiscal 1964 for other than national defense, or \$2,062,000,000 more than now currently proposed for fiscal 1963. It is \$9,348,000,000 above fiscal 1961—a 27-percent increase.

And it is \$22,818,000,000, or 111 percent, above fiscal 1954. And this largely on borrowed money.

National defense expenditures in this budget for 1964 are estimated at 5 percent above 1963; 17 percent above 1961; and 18 percent above 1954. There is of course universal agreement that large and continuing sums are required for defense and so far as can be seen they will continue at high levels, but nothing—not even defense items—within the power of men to alter, beginning in this session, should logically be regarded beyond reach of the knife. We are between a rock and a hard place and non-defense spending for things we could do without or defer until we have the money in hand helped put us there. And this budget proposes to add new programs. And to add to the cost of old programs. And without the money in sight to pay for all or any of it.

The duty of economy is not debatable. It is manifest and imperative.

Mr. Speaker, I include official figures on national defense and nondefense expenditures in support:

Budget expenditures for national defense and nondefense—in summary

[NOTE.—Round figures used]

	National defense	Other than national defense	Total
President's fiscal 1964 budget estimates of expenditures (Jan. 17, 1963):			
1964 over current budget estimate for fiscal 1963.....	+\$2,429,000,000	+\$2,062,000,000	+\$4,491,000,000
1964 over fiscal 1961.....	+7,939,000,000	+9,348,000,000	+17,287,000,000
1964 over fiscal 1954.....	+8,447,000,000	+22,818,000,000	+31,265,000,000

Source: Budget documents

National defense and nondefense—Net budget expenditures

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	National defense functions		Other than national defense	Total net budget expenditures
	Defense, military	Total		
Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year).....	43,610	50,442	23,678	74,120
Fiscal 1954.....	40,336	46,986	20,551	67,537
Fiscal 1955.....	35,532	40,695	23,604	64,299
Fiscal 1956.....	35,791	40,722	25,501	66,224
Fiscal 1957.....	38,439	43,360	25,606	68,966
Fiscal 1958.....	39,062	44,234	27,135	71,369
Fiscal 1959.....	41,233	46,491	33,851	80,342
Fiscal 1960.....	41,215	45,691	30,848	76,539
Fiscal 1961.....	43,227	47,494	34,021	81,515
Increase in level during the 8 years 1954-61.....	+2,891	+508	+13,470	+13,978
Fiscal 1962.....	46,826	51,103	36,684	87,787
Fiscal 1963 (revised estimate shown in fiscal 1964 budget).....	48,300	53,004	41,307	94,311
Fiscal 1964 (President's budget estimate and proposal, January 1963).....	51,000	55,438	43,369	98,802
Comparisons:				
1964 budget compared with 1963 currently estimated.....	+2,700	+2,429	+2,062	+4,497
1964 budget compared with 1961 actual.....	+7,773	+7,939	+9,348	+17,281
1964 budget compared with 1954 actual.....	+10,664	+8,447	+22,818	+31,265

¹ Represents 65 percent increase, 1961 over 1954.

² For national defense functions the 1964 budget compares as follows: Above 1963 by 5 percent; above 1961 by 17 percent; and above 1954 by 18 percent.

³ Represents 5 percent increase, 1964 budget estimate over 1963 currently estimated.

⁴ Represents 27 percent increase, 1964 budget estimate over 1961 actual.

⁵ Represents 111 percent increase, 1964 budget estimate over 1954 actual.

NOTE.—"National defense" follows the 1964 budget classification and consists of defense, military (including civil defense), military assistance, AEC, stockpiling strategic materials, expansion of defense production, and selective service, and emergency preparedness work.

Source: Budget documents.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me so that I may ask the gentleman from Missouri a question?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I think the record ought to show at this point, and I believe the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations will agree, that if the House and the other body had gone along with the House Committee on Appropriations during these last 10 years, we would have reduced our national budgets by some \$30 to \$40 billion and that amount would have been saved; is that not true?

Mr. CANNON. We, on the House side, in the House committee, always set the figure at the lowest point but, of course, the total figures are altogether too high. The gentleman has in the main stated the situation correctly. But I want to emphasize this, my friends. The President of the United States, for whom I have the highest affection and the warmest regard, has for the last 2 years after the adjournment of Congress, issued an order to his departments that they are not to use all of the money that Congress has voted for civil employees—because they are not all needed. It is not the President, but the Congress, the men who sit here before us today in this body and the other body, who are allowing these excessive appropriations. Twice the President of the United States has announced in October, after Congress adjourned, that the departments should not spend all the money appropriated for certain purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes more? I think I can conclude in 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Seeing that the gentleman is doing a great job in the public interest and being very much interested in his remarks, I am very glad to yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

NEW AUTHORITY TO OBLIGATE GOVERNMENT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Congress must first appropriate or otherwise enact authority to obligate the Government before the departments can remove a dollar from the Treasury for any purpose at any time. The executive branch recommends, urges, pressures, promises, but only Congress can grant the obligatory authority. Congress does not act directly on the expenditure budget of \$98,802,000,000. We act on the obligatory budget. And once you obligate, you have to expend to satisfy the claim. So the important longrun figure, the most accurate barometer to future spending in today's budget is not the \$98,802,000,000 spending total but rather the \$111,843,000,000 of new obligating authority urged by the President—\$3,916,000,000 of which is for supplements to fiscal 1963 and \$107,927,000,000

is for the fiscal year 1964 beginning July 1 next.

Last year the obligational budget first exceeded \$100 billion in time of peace. This budget request tops that. Budgets of recent years have been recordbreakers. And so is this one. Every year they urge more. And every year Congress appropriates more—including more for nondefense. And practically every year it carries us deeper in debt, just as this budget proposes to do.

Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody.

This budget urges upon this session new obligating authority \$4,735,000,000 above the current year total even assuming approval of the \$3,916,000,000 anticipated supplementals for fiscal 1963—\$2,212,000,000 for national defense and \$2,523,000,000 for other than national defense.

This budget urges for fiscal 1964 new obligating authority \$21,252,000,000

above what was enacted for the last fiscal year of the previous administration, fiscal 1961—\$10,708,000,000 more for national defense and \$10,544,000,000 more for nondefense items.

This budget urges for fiscal 1964 new obligating authority \$27,060,000,000 above the \$80,867,000,000 recommended in the outgoing fiscal 1962 budget submitted by President Eisenhower 2 years ago yesterday—\$10,424,000,000 more for national defense and \$16,636,000,000 more for nondefense items.

This budget urges for fiscal 1964 new obligating authority \$45,162,000,000 above what was enacted for fiscal year 1954, the first year after Korea—\$17,801,000,000 more for national defense and \$27,361,000,000 more for nondefense items.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, who will deny that the spenders and the special pleaders are on both sides of the aisle and in both administrations, and borrowing the money to make up for our failure to pay as we go along, and in times of record national revenues.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the Government public men have contended with the size of the Federal Establishment—manifested in part by the number of civilian employees. The problem today is at its peacetime worst. Members of Congress have inveighed against a swollen bureaucracy in every campaign before the folks back home. It is a standard plank in every economy and efficiency platform. The situation was evidently so bad last fall—after Congress had made the appropriations and gone home—that the President told the departments to reduce personnel and to refrain from filling jobs. Many departments have already ordered percentage cuts. They have been told not to fill jobs for which they have the appropriations in hand.

But of course you understand the root of the trouble is too much money. Excessive appropriations. They cannot hire employees without money so when you decry the number of employees you are really talking about excessive appropriations.

The President knows we have appropriated more than was necessary—why else would he direct the departments to hire fewer employees even though they have the money in hand? The question answers itself—more money than the minimum necessary. You have been doing that right along. This is the second straight year the President directed them to hire less employees than Congress provided for. He issued a similar directive in October of 1961.

And yet this budget today would add over 36,000 new employees in fiscal year 1964. And that on top of 127,000 added since June of 1961 when the present administration assumed full fiscal-year control. And do not jump to the conclusion they are in the defense items; defense employees are reduced, according to the budget. I will insert a table here so you can see for yourself. Scan the right hand columns and see where we have been providing excess appropriations—nondefense appropriations. Every single nondefense line on the table shows an increase. More employees voted right here on the floor. And 2 years in a row, after we made the appropriations and went home, the President directed the agencies not to hire to the limit of their appropriations. Nondefense appropriations. Look at the list of agencies. Read it. Now listen to what the President told the agencies.

In the fall of 1961, October 26:

There is no question that employment can be held substantially below the levels which would be possible under the funds authorized by the Congress, if strong efforts are made to achieve increases in efficiency . . . and to staff each activity with only the minimum number of employees needed to carry out our objectives.

Again from the same directive:

I much prefer that obligational authority remain uncommitted where there is any

President's requests to Congress for new authority to obligate the Government—In summary

	National defense functions	Other than national defense	Total
President's fiscal 1964 budget of Jan. 17, 1963, compared with—			
1964 budget compared with 1963 currently proposed—	+\$2,212,000,000	+\$2,523,000,000	+\$4,735,000,000
1964 budget compared with 1961 actually enacted—	+10,708,000,000	+10,544,000,000	+21,252,000,000
1964 budget compared with 1954 actually enacted—	+17,801,000,000	+27,361,000,000	+45,162,000,000

Source: Budget documents.

Authority to obligate the Government (new obligational authority), which precedes "Budget expenditures"

[NOTE.—Rounded amounts used]

Fiscal year or budget	National defense functions		Other than national defense		Total new obligational authority
	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	
1953 enacted (Korean war year)-----	\$57,298,000,000	71.3	\$23,010,000,000	28.7	\$80,308,000,000
1954 enacted-----	38,901,000,000	62.1	23,864,000,000	37.9	62,765,000,000
1955 enacted-----	33,656,000,000	59.0	23,420,000,000	41.0	57,076,000,000
1956 enacted-----	35,903,000,000	56.8	27,295,000,000	43.2	63,198,000,000
1957 enacted-----	40,234,000,000	57.3	29,945,000,000	42.7	70,179,000,000
1958 enacted-----	40,448,000,000	53.0	35,897,000,000	47.0	76,345,000,000
1959 enacted-----	45,517,000,000	55.9	35,848,000,000	44.1	81,365,000,000
1960 enacted-----	44,761,000,000	56.3	34,813,000,000	43.7	79,574,000,000
1961 enacted-----	45,994,000,000	53.1	40,681,000,000	46.9	86,675,000,000
Increase in level in 8 years, 1961 over 1954-----	+7,093,000,000	29.7	+16,817,000,000	70.3	+23,910,000,000
1962 enacted-----	52,414,000,000	56.4	40,448,000,000	43.6	92,862,000,000
1963 total now proposed, including supplementals-----	54,490,000,000	52.8	48,702,000,000	47.2	¹ 103,192,000,000
1964 budget, total proposed-----	56,702,000,000	52.5	51,225,000,000	47.5	² 107,927,000,000
Comparisons:					
1964 budget compared with 1963 currently proposed-----	+2,212,000,000	46.7	+2,523,000,000	53.3	+4,735,000,000
1964 budget compared with 1961 enacted-----	+10,708,000,000	50.4	+10,544,000,000	49.6	+21,252,000,000
1964 budget compared with 1954 enacted-----	+17,801,000,000	39.4	+27,361,000,000	60.6	+45,162,000,000

¹ Includes \$3,916,000,000 proposed supplementals for 1963 of which \$2,000,000,000 is additional Export-Import Bank borrowing authority; \$500,000,000 is for public works acceleration; \$394,235,000 is for pay increases; and numerous other supplementals.

² Includes \$2,727,468,000 applicable to proposed legislation.

NOTE.—"National defense" functions consist of defense military (including civil defense), foreign military assistance, AEC, stockpiling strategic materials, defense production expansion, selective service, and emergency preparedness work.

Source: Budget documents.

doubt that expenditures would yield substantial returns to the national interest.

In the fall of 1962—October 11—in a directive on tightening up on manpower and its utilization and referring to productivity gains:

Such an accomplishment would translate into tens of thousands of Federal jobs that either could be eliminated or would not have to be added to the present numbers.

It is expected that the same amount of work will be performed by increasingly fewer people.

There is only one certain way—and it is simple method—available to the Congress to assure the result and that is to cut the budgets. The time to begin is in this session. The Committee on Appropriations cannot do it alone. The Members will have to manifest their support. May we urge each Member to hammer away at these excessive budgets. The President's directives concede we have appropriated for too many jobs in each of the last 2 years.

Summary of civilian employment in the executive branch

Description	As of June 30—			Estimated change, June 1964, compared with—	
	1961 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate	June 30, 1961	June 30, 1963
Executive Office of the President	2,767	1,681	1,769	-998	+88
Department of Agriculture	102,557	116,268	121,583	+19,026	+5,315
Department of Commerce	30,337	32,802	36,299	+5,962	+3,497
Department of Defense:					
Military ¹	1,012,376	1,032,739	1,022,612	+10,237	-10,127
Civil ²	30,032	32,260	32,558	+2,521	+293
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	70,335	85,306	89,237	+18,902	+5,931
Department of the Interior	59,458	70,721	74,720	+15,262	+3,999
Department of Justice	31,262	32,607	33,372	+2,110	+765
Department of Labor	7,491	9,620	10,913	+3,422	+1,293
Post Office Department	582,447	598,009	608,259	+25,812	+9,650
Department of State	23,814	24,633	25,368	+1,554	+735
Agency for International Development	14,906	16,588	16,540	+1,634	-48
Peace Corps	227	1,051	1,251	+1,024	+200
Treasury Department	79,970	87,494	91,643	+11,673	+4,149
Atomic Energy Commission	6,846	7,152	7,330	+484	+178
Federal Aviation Agency	42,838	48,040	48,666	+5,828	+626
General Services Administration	29,944	34,349	37,557	+7,613	+3,208
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,507	14,235	15,037	+3,530	+802
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	17,471	29,147	33,100	+15,629	+3,953
Veterans' Administration	174,110	176,881	177,290	+3,180	+409
Other agencies	76,335	83,858	85,434	+9,099	+1,576
Total	2,407,029	2,534,041	2,570,533	+163,504	+36,492

¹ Consists of civilian employment for military functions and military assistance.

² Employment for Panama Canal Zone Government, Panama Canal Company, and U.S. Soldiers' Home is included in "Other agencies" below.

³ Excludes project employees for the public works acceleration program which are estimated to total approximately 35,000 by June 1963, and are estimated to be nominal by June 1964 under the existing program.

NOTE.—Although most of the employees shown here are paid from administrative budget funds, some are paid from trust funds; and in the case of some agencies, the table includes employees who are paid from other funds outside the scope of the budget document. The figures include tentative estimates for employment under appropriations proposed for later transmittal. In accordance with definitions of the Civil Service Commission, the figures cover both those employees who are working on June 30, and also part-time and intermittent employees who work at any time during the month of June.

Sources: Tables in budgets for 1963 and 1964.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, I include official data on the size and trend of the rising national debt.

Under the budget today, the propositions urged upon the Congress will, if adopted, push the debt to \$315,604,000,000 at least. The message admits to uncertainty because of other uncertainties. But one thing is certain—we will be asked, for the 12th succeeding time, to again raise the debt ceiling—essentially an ineffectual annual ritual—first by raising the fiscal 1963 ceiling to \$308,000,000,000 at June 30 and then to something beyond the \$315,604,000,000—the budget is uncertain on the point. But as everyone must know, as a practical matter it is too late to limit expenditures after they have been voted and obligations incurred. And it is becoming absurd to cling to a "temporary" ceiling increase for a few years and then blithely convert some of it to a permanent status.

For every one who is hacking at the roots there are a hundred hacking at the branches.

For the first time in history the national debt crossed the \$300,000,000,000 mark last August. Now it is to go higher and higher, for at least 3 more years according to Secretary Dillon's statement in the press today—much of it to meet the demands for more nondefense spending beyond what we are willing to pay.

Just to carry the debt the annual interest cost in this budget amounts to \$10,020,000,000, or about 10 cents out of the budget dollar—the budget for the entire Government when the country was flat on its back in the 1930's never got near what we pay today in annual interest alone. You can grasp the dimensions of this mandatory item when you realize that every minute the clock ticks, day and night, interest accrues at the rate of \$19,000. Incredible.

A recent computation is even more revealing. If we set about to pay off a \$300,000,000,000 debt at a modest rate by the year 2100, or 138 years from now, and for simplicity assume one payment of interest and principal a year at 3 percent, we would pay \$9,154,923,649.00

each year but the total outlay would be \$1,263,379,463,562.00. Unbelievable. Yet we do not sense any disposition in this budget for retrenchment or return to sound fiscal policies or any evidence of determination to make even a modest start on methodical reduction of the debt. And no provision for unforeseen national emergencies.

The peak in World War I was \$26,596,701,648.01.

The peak in World War II was \$279,764,369,348.29. Most of the debt up to 1947 was unavoidably accumulated through unprecedented war expenditures.

The lowest postwar debt was \$251,553,319,739.98 on April 30, 1949. We were making some progress in liquidating the war debt.

In January 1953 the debt stood at \$267,393,784,247.66. We had financed the Korean war.

Eight years later, in January 1961, the debt had climbed to \$290,174,764,757.12 as a result of continued spending beyond record national revenues, primarily for nondefense purposes. That is the situation—an increase of \$22,780,980,509.46 in the 8 years—none of them war years. That accumulation was equal to that of the first 130 years in the development of this great American wilderness of wealth by self-reliant, hardworking, rugged, imaginative pioneer people.

When the Congress convened last week—January 9, 1963—the national debt had reached \$303,451,350,959.26—up by \$13,276,586,202.14 in 2 years and it is shown as rising to \$315,604,000,000 under this 1964 budget at June, 1964. What will the next figure be—much higher, in any event, according to Secretary Dillon in today's press. When will the limit be reached? How long will foreign bankers defer cashing in more of our dollars for gold as they watch us pile up more and more debt?

From the debate here on the floor in March 1865 at a time of great stress:

Have we not already, like other nations, instead of providing for the principal, provided only for the interest of these great debts? What follows? That money borrowed, being obtained without sweat or sacrifice, is spent lightly, without economy or care. A revenue raised at the expense of posterity is sure to be squandered wastefully. Waste begets want, and the sums raised by loans will commonly be large.

It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that the observation is especially applicable to the present situation.

It is said that the Federal debt, on a per person basis, has been dropping since World War II. Exactly true, because the population has grown faster than the debt. But there is only one population—and they owe all the public debt, State and local as well as Federal. If it is ever to be paid, all debt must come from the same pocket and the same paycheck. And according to available published figures, on a per person basis and despite a rising population, the American people owed four times more public debt in 1960 than they did in 1940; more in 1960 than they did in 1950; more in 1960 than in 1953.

Federal debt on significant dates

Date	Classification	Total direct and guaranteed debt ¹	Per capita ²
WORLD WAR I			
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt.....	\$1,282,044,346.28	\$12.36
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt.....	26,596,701,648.01	250.18
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt.....	16,026,087,087.07	129.66
WORLD WAR II			
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program.....	* 48,496,601,692.96	367.08
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt.....	61,363,867,932.26	458.47
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt.....	279,764,369,348.29	1,989.75
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased.....	269,898,484,032.56	1,908.79
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt ⁴	251,553,319,739.98	1,690.29
SINCE KOREA			
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950).....	257,376,855,385.01	1,696.74
Dec. 31, 1952	267,445,125,544.96	* 1,687.90
Nov. 30, 1962	Highest debt ⁵	305,892,963,927.29	* 1,628.39
Dec. 31, 1961	Debt a year ago.....	296,498,920,739.92	* 1,600.19
Nov. 30, 1962	Debt last month.....	305,892,963,927.29	* 1,628.39
Dec. 31, 1962	Debt this month.....	303,987,703,889.27	* 1,616.49

¹ Does not include obligations owned by the Treasury.² Includes outstanding matured principal of guaranteed obligations for which cash is held by the Treasurer of the United States in the general fund balance for the payment of such obligations.³ Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.⁴ Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross).....	\$251,245,889,059.02
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury).....	23,576,001.12

Total direct and guaranteed debt..... 251,269,765,060.14

⁵ Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was Nov. 30, 1962, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross).....	\$305,390,198,052.29
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury).....	502,765,875.00

Total direct and guaranteed debt (includes \$371,956,195.15 not subject to statutory limitation)..... 305,892,963,927.29

* Revised.
b Subject to revision.

Federal, State, and local tax receipts, expenditures, and debt—On a per capita basis, selected fiscal years

Year	Per capita				Percentage distribution			
	Total	Federal	State	Local	Total	Federal	State	Local
1. Tax receipts:								
1940.....	\$109	\$43	\$32	\$34	100	39.2	29.2	31.6
1946.....	370	286	45	39	100	77.3	12.2	10.5
1950.....	369	255	60	54	100	69.1	16.3	14.6
1953.....	576	433	77	67	100	75.2	13.3	11.5
1960.....	715	499	114	102	100	70.1	15.5	14.4
2. Expenditures:								
1940.....	156	77	35	44	100	449.3	22.3	28.5
1946.....	602	502	47	53	100	83.5	7.7	8.8
1950.....	473	301	86	86	100	63.7	18.2	18.1
1953.....	707	514	90	103	100	72.7	12.8	14.5
1960.....	864	548	153	164	100	63.2	17.6	19.2
3. Gross debt:								
1940.....	483	328	27	128	100	67.9	5.7	26.4
1946.....	2,154	2,034	18	102	100	94.4	.8	4.8
1950.....	1,893	1,731	36	127	100	91.4	1.9	6.7
1953.....	1,925	1,708	50	167	100	88.7	2.6	8.7
1960.....	2,010	1,617	105	288	100	80.5	5.2	14.3

BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

Mr. Speaker, the following official budget figures summarize the steadily rising budgets of the last 11 years during which Treasury budget books were thrown out of balance by deficit spending—spending beyond record national revenues and borrowing to meet the shortage:

Deficit during the 8 fiscal years under the previous administration.....	\$21,953,000,000
Deficit during the 3 fiscal years of the present administration on the basis of actual 1962; currently estimated 1963, and the budget estimates for 1964.....	27,091,000,000
Total deficit, 11 years 1954-64, on basis shown.....	49,044,000,000

Net "budget" receipts and net "budget" expenditures, 12 years, 1953-64

[In millions of dollars]			
Fiscal year	Net "budget" receipts	Net "budget" expenditures	Budget surplus (+) or deficit (-)
1953 (Korean war year).....	64,671	74,120	-9,449
1954 (from July 1953).....	64,420	67,537	-3,117
1955.....	60,209	64,389	-4,180
1956.....	67,850	66,224	+1,626
1957.....	70,562	68,966	+1,596
1958.....	68,550	71,369	-2,819
1959.....	67,915	80,342	-12,427
1960.....	77,763	76,539	+1,224
1961 (to June 1961).....	77,659	81,515	-3,856
8 years, 1954-61.....	554,928	576,881	-21,953

Net "budget" receipts and net "budget" expenditures, 12 years, 1953-64—Continued

[In millions of dollars]			
Fiscal year	Net "budget" receipts	Net "budget" expenditures	Budget surplus (+) or deficit (-)
1962 (from July 1961).....	81,409	87,787	-6,378
1963 (current estimate in 1964 budget).....	85,500	94,311	-8,811
1964 estimate (original budget).....	* 86,900	* 98,802	-11,902
3 years, 1962-64, on basis shown.....	253,809	280,900	-27,091
11 years, 1954-64, on basis shown.....	808,737	857,781	-49,044

¹ Includes \$1,249,000,000 estimated out of supplementals proposed to be submitted for 1963.² On basis of economic assumptions and tax reduction and revision recommendations in 1964 budget (a GNP of \$578,000,000,000 in calendar 1963; personal income of \$459,000,000,000; corporation profits of \$53,000,000,000; proposed tax changes and revisions, offset in part by proposed speedup of corporation tax payments and initial stimulus to economy from tax program, a net estimated loss in 1964 of \$2,700,000,000; new transportation user tax proposals, \$100,000,000 additional; and assumes extension of present excise taxes due to decline or expire in June 1963).³ Includes \$1,202,000,000 applicable to proposed legislation for new purposes or programs.

COST OF LIVING—VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

The cost-of-living index continues to creep upward. It pinches every family budget. The value of the dollar declines. And we cannot—they cannot—forget that today's dollar is worth only 45 cents. Nor can we ignore the fact that the cost of living hit new high-water marks six times in 1962.

These are the inevitable results. And what about the future if we keep spending more than we take in—constantly tempting the fires of inflation?

Consumer price index and purchasing power of the dollar

Years	Consumer Price Index (1947-49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar (calendar year 1939=100 cents) ¹
	All items	Food	
1939.....	59.4	47.1	100.0
1940.....	59.9	47.8	99.2
1941.....	62.9	52.2	94.4
1942.....	69.7	61.3	85.2
1943.....	74.0	68.3	80.3
1944.....	75.2	67.4	79.0
1945.....	76.9	68.9	77.2
1946.....	83.4	79.0	71.2
1947.....	95.5	95.9	62.2
1948.....	102.8	104.1	57.8
1949.....	101.8	100.0	58.3
1950.....	102.8	101.2	57.8
1951.....	111.0	112.6	53.5
1952.....	113.5	114.6	52.3
1953.....	114.4	112.8	51.9
1954.....	114.8	112.6	51.7
1955.....	114.5	110.9	51.9
1956.....	116.2	111.7	51.1
1957.....	120.2	115.4	49.4
1958.....	123.5	120.3	48.1
1959.....	124.6	118.3	47.7
1960.....	126.5	119.7	47.0
1961.....	127.8	121.0	46.5
Selected months:			
1946-June.....	79.8	72.1	74.4
1950-June.....	101.8	100.5	58.3
1952-December.....	114.1	113.8	52.1
1958-December.....	123.7	118.7	48.0
1959-December.....	125.5	117.8	47.3
1960-December.....	* 127.5	121.4	46.6
1961:			
June.....	* 127.6	120.9	46.6
July.....	* 128.1	122.0	46.4
August.....	* 128.0	121.2	46.4
September.....	* 128.3	121.1	46.3
October.....	* 128.4	120.9	46.3
November.....	128.3	120.3	46.3
December.....	128.2	120.4	46.3

See footnotes at end of table.

Consumer price index and purchasing power of the dollar—Continued

Years	Consumer Price Index (1947-49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar (calendar year 1939=100 cents) ¹
	All items	Foods	
1962:			
January.....	128.2	121.0	46.3
February.....	128.6	121.7	46.2
March.....	128.8	121.8	46.1
April.....	129.1	122.0	46.0
May.....	129.2	122.1	46.0
June.....	129.4	122.5	45.9
July.....	129.4	122.5	45.9
August.....	130.2	123.7	45.6
September.....	130.1	123.1	45.7
October.....	130.1	122.8	45.7
November.....	130.1	122.8	45.7

¹ As measured by the BLS Consumer Price Index.
² New record high.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Debt Analysis, Jan. 4, 1963.

GOLD SUPPLY AND THE CLAIMS AGAINST IT

Mr. Speaker, I include pertinent data on our dwindling gold supply. We have lost nearly \$7,000,000,000 of our reserve since January 1958.

Our supply is now just below \$16,000,000,000.

Decline in gold assets of the United States, 5 years 1958-1962

Date or period	Gold assets	Change
Dec. 31, 1957.....	\$22,780,675,342	
Dec. 31, 1958.....	20,534,104,913	-\$2,246,570,429
Dec. 31, 1959.....	19,456,135,794	-1,077,969,119
Dec. 31, 1960.....	17,766,797,708	-1,689,338,086
Dec. 31, 1961.....	16,888,905,838	-877,891,870
Dec. 31, 1962.....	15,978,190,463	-910,715,375
Decline in gold holdings in 5 years, 1958-62.....		-6,802,484,879

¹ It was \$15,978,113,685 on Jan. 9, 1963.

Source: Daily Treasury statements.

Our tenuous gold position

[In billions of dollars.]

Date	U.S. gold stocks	Gold stock (above required 25 per cent backing for currency and deposits)	Possible foreign claims	Potential shortage of gold with present 25 per cent backing provision
1957 (Dec. 31).....	\$22.9	\$10.8	\$14.9	\$4.1
1958 (Dec. 31).....	20.6	8.5	15.6	7.1
1959 (Dec. 31).....	19.5	7.9	17.7	10.4
1960 (Dec. 31).....	17.8	6.1	18.8	12.7
1961 (Dec. 31).....	16.9	4.9	20.4	15.5
1962 (October—latest for which data is available)...	16.0	4.2	21.6	17.4
Change, January 1958 through October 1962.....	-6.9	-6.6	+6.7	+13.3

Source: Department of Commerce.

All but \$4,200,000,000 is earmarked as backing for our money supply on a 25-percent basis.

There are possible foreign claims outstanding of \$21,600,000,000.

That leaves a potential shortage—an outside extreme, but illustrating the problem—of \$17,400,000,000 after allowing for the 25-percent backing.

If we insist on further cheapening our dollar it would, manifestly, be absurd to

delude ourselves into thinking foreign nations would sit idly by holding our dollars and securities when all they have to do is demand gold. They are watching us because their interests are at stake. And it would be to the interest of every American if the Congress—every Member of both Houses—watched the situation as closely and did something about it. The size and complexion of today's 1964 budget make it an imperative national necessity that we put our fiscal policy on a sound and more sensible footing before it is too late.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, the inescapable consequences of indefinitely continuing to spend more than we take in as we have done in 28 of the last 34 budgets and for at least 2 more years according to Secretary Dillon in today's press—much of it conclusively shown to be for nondefense purposes—are not precisely predictable. This budget offers absolutely no hope of an early reversal. Granting further growth of national revenues, the relentless upward trend of spending over the last many years strongly suggests the probability that any additional income would be consumed entirely by additional propositions of expenditure. Secretary Dillon, in today's press, foresees deficits in 1965 and 1966.

This admittedly tenuous budget is too high. It can be cut. It ought to be drastically revised. Undoubtedly the people would demand that we practice some restraint if they were but harshly aware of what they are paying Uncle Sam each week or each month in income taxes. The withholding tax system was devised to accelerate and facilitate collection of revenues to help finance World War II. And while it undoubtedly still serves to facilitate collections it sedates the people. It is painless. It mitigates the consciousness of tax burden. It caters to the illusion that money in Washington is free for the asking. That the Treasury is a bottomless resource with a boundless supply of dollars. I am not so certain but that revision of the system would be decidedly in the public interest. The people would demand an accounting if they were fully and painfully conscious of the tax bite, if periodically they had to draw a check or money order in favor of Uncle Sam and mail it to Washington.

The Committee on Appropriations will welcome every suggestion for revision of the portions of the budget committed to it. We would especially appreciate citations to page and line where excessive amounts can be trimmed. Every suggestion will be considered. We do not process all the budget—not even all the expenditure side; some portions first go before the legislative committees. And there are permanent appropriations which do not require annual action. But on items in the regular appropriation bills, we urge every Member to submit suggestions. And in the present critical condition of the budget we hope you will refrain from pressuring the committee to add to the budget. It is already too high. The revenues are short of meeting

the budget. This is no time to urge expenditures. Secretary Dillon, in today's press, foresees a big deficit again in fiscal 1965 and "very possibly" in 1966. This is the time to stop accumulating more debt.

We expect to begin consideration of the budget on Monday. We welcome suggestions.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has made an important and valuable statement. No Member of the Congress in either House is more qualified than is the gentleman from Missouri to evaluate the budget of the Government of the United States. I share his concern at the size of the budget, and even more, with the size of the deficit.

The gentleman from Missouri mentioned that no workable plan for reduction of the national debt has been presented by a Member of the House or of the other body. I should like to draw his attention to H.R. 113. This is a bill I have been introducing ever since the 84th Congress. It provides for an amendment to the Budget and Accounting Act, requiring that the President of the United States, in each fiscal year, include in the budget an item to reduce the national debt by at least \$2 billion. The gentleman from Missouri will agree with me that the Congress and the President could, without any further legislation, reduce the national debt if they desired to do so. But, we are not doing it. We must, to preserve our way of life. In my opinion, it is wrong for us to ever say "Our budget is balanced," until we have provided something for debt reduction. No housewife can balance her budget without providing for payments to be made on debt, no business can do so, and I submit that neither can a government do so.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while my bill may be giving Congress the "idiot treatment" in inducing it to take a step toward reducing the national debt, which it could take anyway, our failure or refusal to make any such reduction seems to indicate that perhaps we deserve this kind of treatment.

I commend H.R. 113 to the consideration of the gentleman from Missouri and to the Committee on Government Operations, to which the bill has again been referred.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from

Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Surely this budget will be not only a recordbreaker—it will also be a backbreaker for our already strained economy. And I find myself constrained to ask the perennial question: Will we ever learn that we cannot keep spending what we do not have for what we do not need? I despair at the answer.

It is astounding that this budget with a built-in deficit of \$11.9 billion could be proposed to this body considering that it now costs nearly this amount, or \$10 billion, annually to service the present debt.

This recordbreaker, \$4.7 billion over the current budget and one-half billion dollars greater than the highest budget during World War II, was particularly surprising to me in light of the President's remarks in this Chamber on Monday—at least, as I understood them—when we find that over one-half of this \$4.7 billion increase is for nondefense spending. And surely all of us must be surprised upon learning that there is proposed a net increase of 36,000 Government employees despite a proposed decrease of 10,000 in the Defense Department—in other words, an increase of 46,000 personnel for nondefense functions.

I note that of this increase, 5,000 would be in the Washington area which, in my opinion, certainly has its share already. If a bona fide need for these additional employees exists, which I seriously question, then they should be in the various districts and States. I submit that a real and immediate need does exist for the employment of additional people to find some means of reducing the national debt and restoring some sense of fiscal responsibility to our budget requests.

While I appreciate the tremendously valuable services rendered by our Government workers, I believe that it would be better to reward them adequately rather than constantly to increase their number.

Mr. Speaker, to me it is the height of inconsistency to propose in one breath a reduction in taxes and in the next the highest budget in history. Our action on this matter will reveal whether or not we want to be a generation of free-loaders, letting our children pick up the tab for our folly.

May I say to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that I appreciate his remarks and that he can expect my support in his efforts to pare this overwhelming budget.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, and will look forward to listening to whatever he has to say.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank my able colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Members of this House that I shall carry on as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as a Member of the House of Representatives in the same manner I have carried on in the past, which is to do my best to eliminate all unnecessary and wasteful spending.

I am sure that every member of the Committee on Appropriations who has sat with me behind closed committee doors—as you know, the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations are not open to the public. I wish they were. I have offered many, many motions to reduce Federal expenditures. Some of these were accepted, some were not; but I am proud to say that no bill has ever come to the floor of this House from a subcommittee of which I have been a member that was not below the budget and as you know, Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for the past 20 years.

Now may I say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], my chairman, has just made my speech, to a very great degree. The President's requests that Congress appropriate for fiscal year 1964 \$98,800 million—in cash—out of the U.S. Treasury, and in addition the President asks Congress to give him authority to obligate another \$9 billion expenditure for fiscal year 1964 and thereafter. But considering the cash request of \$98,800 million only, which we know will be spent unless Congress reduces that figure, which most certainly we must, and by taking the President's "estimated" estimate in revenues from every source of \$86,900 million, he agrees that we will have a deficit in fiscal year 1964 of \$11,900 million.

Let us look at a few of the President's budget requests for a moment. The Space Administration is \$4.2 billion in fiscal year 1964. That Administration had \$2.4 billion in 1963. Here is an increase of \$1.8 billion. I daresay that this agency appears to be getting quite out of hand. Maybe some people would like to go to the moon, but so far as I am concerned, I don't want to be a party to spending unnecessary billions upon billions of dollars just to prove that the moon is not made of green cheese. I am willing to spend a reasonable amount, for essential space explorations, but not \$4,200 million in fiscal year 1964, alone.

Now, as to interest on the national debt. The President is asking \$10,100 million for fiscal year 1964 or \$300 million more just to pay the interest on the national debt for fiscal year 1964 than for fiscal year 1963. It is costing each American family over \$16 per month on an average just to pay the interest on our national debt. Of course, there is not much we can do about that except to cut deeply into the President's budget in order to cut down the Federal debt, so we can finally start paying off and thus reduce the national debt.

National defense is in the budget for \$55,400 million or \$2,400 million more than for fiscal year 1963. Everybody wants more than adequate national defense, but surely we can have just that with billions less than is requested now.

Our national debt today is more than 1½ times greater, Mr. Speaker, than the Federal debt of all the other nations of the world all put together, and yet we are being asked this year to appropriate over \$3 billion for foreign aid. A singular situation, when our national debt is 1½ times more than all of the nations in the world put together, and yet we are spending billions of dollars all over the

world. Some 30 years ago, in fiscal 1934 to be exact we had a national debt of \$27 billion. At that time President Roosevelt said we could safely afford a Federal debt of \$75 billion. Look now, today, this very minute, we have a national debt of over \$303 billion—\$276 billion more than our national debt in fiscal 1934. Look again, we have gone in debt over \$9 billion every year during the past 30 years, on an average, and with another deficit of \$11,800 million in the offing for fiscal year 1964.

Now, what will happen when we get to the end of the reckless spending road?

The answer is simple and plain—we will suffer the same fate as has every nation in this world that traveled the wasteful spending route to the end of the road that we have been traveling at breakneck speed for 30 years. The crash came awful fast to those nations. Yes, it came, and fast, when the people lost faith in the stability of the government bonds and they stopped buying those bonds. Then the governments started their printing presses; turning out paper bills by the tons, there was no other recourse, and soon it took a big handful of paper currency just to buy a loaf of bread. You say it cannot happen here? Well, it will happen here, and good proof of that is the flight of our gold to foreign countries who do not have confidence in our American dollar and who demand gold for the goods they sell to us. The gold we have left is the only thing that is backing the paper dollar you have in your pocket today, as all of us know only too well.

Mr. Speaker, I shall at a later date have more to say about the budget—a lot more, I assure my colleagues.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a good deal of interest to a great part of the speech which was made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I am sure all of us are concerned about the debt. But I might say in the 14 years I have been here I have never been before the Committee on Appropriations one single time and asked them for one single appropriation. But I would have been a lot more impressed still if I had not been around here last year and had seen the spectacle of the fight for prestige that went on and a considerable number of weeks of the time of the Congress and the country wasted. I would have been more impressed if the chairman would have devoted himself at that point to trying to reduce the debt instead of trying to increase his own prestige.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when I asked for an hour the other day I had not intended that it be used this way. I am glad I was able to yield some of my time and I am able to adjust what I have to say to the remaining time, which I will do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think the attention paid here by the Members who are on the floor and the fact that the Speaker has not had to gavel for attention and no one was forced to raise

a point of order in the House because of the lack of attention indicates that the Members of the Congress here today have a great concern about the problem that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], talked about so adequately and so eloquently and so understandably. The gentleman has presented what I think has become, and we should recognize, a sad state of affairs in America. The gentleman has presented a dismal picture that ought to give us pause, especially those of us who have the great opportunity and privilege to serve the greatest country in this world.

Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me, and I feel impelled to say, that the more we practice fiscal irresponsibility the more certain we will be that freedom will be weakened, that our liberties that we cherish so much and which we talk about so much will be in jeopardy, and that the great American system of freedom and free enterprise will be weakened, if not eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I say, and I believe sincerely, the more we do this type of thing—that is, practice fiscal irresponsibility to which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations referred and to which others referred and commented on, the more certain we will be that tyranny will come to America in some form. So I would like to suggest that if we need the Federal programs that we have launched out on—and I think many of them are needed; I think there is a place for the Federal Government to participate in answering problems; I think there are areas where only the Federal Government can function effectively and efficiently—I believe there are also other areas that need to take their full share of responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to every Member of Congress, and especially to the leadership on our side, that we work overtime and search for some other answers to these problems and have them presented in this Congress. I think there are answers, there are better answers and sounder answers that ought to be presented and I hope that some of us will make it our business to do this. There is no better way, in my opinion, to serve this great land, this great idea of freedom, than to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that I yielded, and did so gladly, 25 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri and I listened intently as did every Member of the House to what he said. Every word of what he said will appear in the RECORD. Indeed, I hope more than that; I hope that he will elaborate on some of the points and ideas that I am sure he did not have time to comment on, and I suggest to the Members that if he does, this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today will be an eloquent testament to our faith in sound fiscal policy and may, indeed, be a guide and furnish us reasons for thinking on these important questions.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, because I know there are other people who share the feelings that

have been expressed today who would like to make a statement and have it appear in the RECORD, I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this very important subject we have had under discussion for the past 35 or 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the chairman said he had never heard any voice in Congress on the subject of reducing the debt. I would like to say that there have been many of us who have tried to be heard on the House floor, who have talked about it, and who have some convictions about it. I have always voted against increasing the debt limit, because I thought it was our business to find ways and means to pay the bills that are presented as we go. More than that, I have introduced legislation that would require us to reduce the debt every year. That bill has not been introduced again this year, but it will be in the very near future.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, even with increased revenues the President's budget presented today envisions a deficit for next year of almost \$12 billion and recognizes a deficit from the last fiscal year of \$8.8 billion, rather than the previous Treasury estimate of \$7.8 billion.

In the face of this, the administration is plugging for a very sizable tax reduction which would greatly increase the proposed deficit for next year.

Mr. Speaker, whenever a government provides tax reduction to its citizens through bond issues it is doing nothing more than effecting an indirect subsidy to every taxpayer and voter in the nation.

This practice has sounded the death knell for every nation in history that has attempted it.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, The Federal budget for fiscal 1964 is a blueprint for the fiscal suicide of the United States. It is a 1,200 page monstrosity. Indeed it is hard to believe that a President of the United States could so misunderstand basic economics or have facts so misrepresented that he would deliver such a message to the knowledgeable men of Congress and the sensible people they represent.

The President obviously believes that Federal programs and the Federal expenditure of taxpayers' money is the avenue, indeed the primary avenue for U.S. economic growth and improvement of our standard of living. That the contrary is true is evidenced by his recognition that our present tax program is a checkrein on public growth and too heavy a burden for an economy to carry and taxes should be reduced. So his solution is to increase spending in every area of Government, request the addition of 36,000 new employees, in addition to the 150,000 he has added since his inauguration, while at the same time promising to hold nondefense expenditures to the same overall level as this year, re-

gardless of this year's deficit. Then he lists many new programs requiring absolutely new obligational authority which further confounds any attempt at logic. He completely repudiates first, the principle of the yearly balanced budget, an Alger concept of constitutional government; and, second, the balanced budget of the economic cycle which he promised as a platform plank in his campaign. The evidence of this is clearly in this budget of \$122 billion, the highest peacetime expenditure in prosperous times when by his own campaign promise this is the period for restoring a fiscal balance by paying down the debt out of surplus. He reverses his promise now by labeling the deficit resulting from tax cut in prosperous times as necessary and good.

No real effort is made to trim expenditures. Specific figures are contradictory or downright misrepresentations, for example, in agriculture, where he mentions a cut but there is actually increased expenditure. Nowhere is there evidence or specification of the "many desirable programs which must be reduced or postponed" to "keep the budget deficit manageable." On the contrary, he repudiates his own state of the Union message. Buried in the budget message but implicit in any summation of figures is the obvious truth that non-defense expenditures are soaring and yet are being presented as increases necessitated by defense and the cold war.

At a time of deficit financing there is even less justification for more public works projects, boondoggling, logrolling, tradeouts, junkets, and other misuses of the taxpayers' money. This brings us to Federal buildings. I would heartily agree that no new buildings should be started at this time. But for this budget to list a number of new Federal buildings to be built none having the priority and approval of Congress that the Dallas Federal Building has had and then to give no reason for not including it reminds us again of the action which the Democrat leadership took the responsibility for last year that the Dallas building is being held up for political reasons. The administration, President Kennedy and his advisors should be advised that Dallas constituents and this Member of Congress cannot be coerced, bribed, or intimidated for their political convictions. I believe public morality in Dallas is too high, that Dallas people will not capitulate to such treatment.

However, all is not lost since in the budget the President proposes and Congress disposes, it is my hope, my prayer, and my intention that Congress will trim the President's budget, knock out unnecessary expenditures and refuse a tax cut, unless appropriate reductions in spending are made. Toward that end I shall direct my efforts, endorsing and working for a balanced budget, reduced taxes within a balanced budget, a tax reform of the Alger-Baker-Herlong type and an overall effort to get this Nation back on a sound economic footing which alone can undergird us in a world divided, where only one side can win.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF MERIT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my purpose today in taking the floor is to advocate a proposition that I believe is utterly without partisanship. It is what may be called a unifying goal that can have all of us, on both sides of the aisle, pulling together. My bill, which I am introducing today, Mr. Speaker, would enable the Congress of the United States, officially and ceremonially, to give its recognition in a personal and a most dramatic form, to the support of the humanities upon which our system of freedom has been built and with which we became great.

This bill merely asks that the Congress be authorized to present a Congressional Medal of Merit to an American who has, in the opinion of Congress, with the advice and consultation of respected authorities, made contributions to those humanities and arts that have served to strengthen and promote the American ideal here and abroad.

It is as simple, as limited, as forthright as that.

The bill itself specifies that the award is to be made not necessarily regularly, but periodically, from time to time, as great men or women in our society appear who are worthy of what we propose shall be a high and distinguished award.

There are many reasons for proposing such an award. The intrinsic value of the medal would be of relatively little cost to the taxpayer and yet would have great value to the Nation which makes it possible for people everywhere in this country to make individual and collective contributions to the general area of the humanities toward a more worthwhile and rewarding life through unselfish service to our people and to our country.

In discussing the idea with many of my friends, some of whom have an awfully skeptical and critical turn of mind, there seems to be no valid reason to argue against it. On the other hand, the affirmative reasons seem compelling. This recognition, it seems to me, would fill a sadly needed gap in our national attitude towards the humanities and the arts.

Mr. Speaker, it is not overstating the case when we observe that the American tragedy in international public relations is that the image of our country has been viciously and incredibly distorted. Too often they have been too successful in this.

The record shows clearly that no nation in the world at any time in the whole of human history has contributed so much of itself, in terms of legislation, in dollars, in dedication, in sheer educational genius to the uplift of its own people by education. Our celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Land-Grant Act is a recent spectacular example, notable but not exceptional. This effort on behalf of education—and particularly in the humanities as well as in science—is, of course, the stone at the head of the corner in the structure of our democracy.

Not only by public—that is governmental and legislative appropriation—but from private sources, an immense

treasure has poured from our people as a whole, into the needs of the education of the individual and the mass.

This is an extraordinary record and it stands out as one of the high watermarks in the story of American civilization.

Yet, a vast proportion of mankind from one end of this planet to the other sees our society as selfishly centered in a dynamic plunge towards materialism in its most oppressive and allegedly ugly forms. We are accused of perpetually boasting about our gross national product now reaching toward \$600 billion annually. Our most altruistic motives and our unrivaled and unprecedented generosity as indicated by foreign aid from lend-lease and the Marshall plan to the Agency for International Development have been tortured into a picture that presents us as doing it all from motives of self.

Our enemies say there is not a drop of the milk of human kindness in any of this. Yet nothing but a Judaeo-Christian philosophy inspires most of this phenomenal program for the help of those less fortunate than we are. We know that and our enemies, of course, know it. But, up to now, this is not the portrait that has been given the world to see. Up to now we seem to have lacked the skill or the will, or both, to represent our actions for what they are.

The blame, in my judgment, rests in large part on those who willfully and deliberately bear false witness against us. But part of the blame, and no small part, rests without a shadow of a doubt upon our own shoulders. We have in the first instance shown a very limited talent for international public relations. We can advertise among ourselves gadgets and filter cigarettes, and shoes with spike heels or no heels at all, and mouth washes. But the greatest product of all time, the product that makes our contribution to the story of man the equal of anything that has been yet produced by the Graeco-Roman and the Judaeo-Christian civilization—that story we have been unable to peddle as successfully as we can or should to the millions on this earth who seem to misunderstand us.

We can sell cosmetics and beer but we have yet to learn how to sell liberty.

And liberty is our foremost product.

This bill that I propose to the House today will not of itself remedy this situation. But it is a significant step in the direction of throwing a national shaft of light on our true portrait as a people who appreciate and therefore recognize the great artists among us—artists in stirring literature, artists in any of the arts, and artists in what generally we call the humanities. The gesture of bestowing such a medal of merit on the greats in these fields would have the effect of personalizing and dramatizing, of advertising and doing honor not only to the individual who has been chosen, but to the Congress itself and to the American people. This, says this award, in part, is what we truly are, a people who have respect for and bestow honor upon the outstanding personalities in American culture, in the broad but important area we call the humanities.

This, Mr. Speaker, is really the burden of my message and my bill.

Inherent in the bill are provisions designed to prevent unwise or unthought-out decisions in the matter of making the proposed awards. Thus the awards are to be made by a joint committee of the House and the Senate. This committee is to name its own chairman. The committee will be composed of four Members of the House of Representatives, two from the majority party and two from the minority party, and four Members from the Senate also equally divided between the two parties. They are to be appointed by the Speaker and the Vice President. The chairman of this committee is authorized to receive recommendations as to whom the Medal of Merit shall be awarded. This is so stated in the bill. Moreover, the committee may seek recommendations from and the advice and assistance of a committee of experts. By experts I mean, for example, as provided in the bill, the Librarian of the Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the National Music Council, the American Studies Association, the Modern Language Association, the American National Theater and Academy, and the American Academy of Arts and Letters, and such other organizations and individuals as may be regarded advisable.

The only money mentioned in this bill is an authorization of \$2,500 per award to carry out the provisions of this act.

It may be inevitable and vital to our defense in our time to explode a missile-borne hydrogen bomb 200 miles in the air. And it may be inescapable that the story of such a bomb will fill the newspapers and the communication media of the world more prominently than any other event of the day. But I maintain that this—however inescapable in the world that now surrounds us—ought somehow to be offset by exposing to mankind another side of our civilization and our culture.

This award aims to do that.

This award aims to do for the man of letters and the arts what we have already done so well for the heroes who do valiant things on the field of battle beyond the call of duty to protect our country and our way of life. We have the Congressional Medal of Honor. No American lives who would not cherish such a decoration. Is it not time we had a medal for those men and women in our midst who achieve immortal distinction in the humanities? Thus our own people may be moved to a deeper recognition of their own folklore and a better understanding of themselves, and the world around us will see us more and more as we really are: great in our economy, of course; great in defense, of course; foremost in living standards for the mass of our people, but great and outstanding also in the humanities and our general culture.

I should like to call attention to the fact that the president of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, made a very pertinent comment on this matter the other day. He is Luther Skaggs, who won his medal by leading a marine as-

sault against the Japanese on Guam in World War II. He said:

Courage is not restricted to those who have been honored for deeds performed on the field of battle. In all of America's wars, many men have fallen, unseen and unsung, with no one to witness their courage. So, too, there are countless unsung heroes in civilian life.

I remark here only that among these unsung heroes in civilian life are the Americans this bill aims to accord this great national distinction. The medal, it is proposed, will be of gold, but its real gold rests in its glory for the recipient and for us all as a nation, for having produced the type of genius who serves his country and mankind.

If, by this bill, we give the endorsement of the Congress of the United States to this side of American life, by this award of merit, we are performing, I believe, a service to American history, to the American people, and to the men and women among us who deserve our recognition.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if Congress should give further public affirmation of the humanities it would reflect an interest in promoting a fine kind of patriotism through the encouragement of learning, writing, and teaching of history. Moreover, it would develop a greater appreciation of literature, art, music, and philosophy of America and the interpretation of the American ideals through these arts that are so worthwhile and seem so necessary in the battle for the minds and hearts of people everywhere today. And, we should remember also that it is in the understanding and the living of the philosophy of our forebears which make us different and great.

I ask only that we do for ourselves what the Nobel prize and kindred awards have thus far been doing for us. Let the Congress of the United States, officially and ceremonially, give due recognition to the achievements of our outstanding minds, and help them and us on the path to cultural immortality.

THE IOWA PLAN FOR GROWTH AND PROGRESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, since the launching of sputnik by the Soviet Union there has been a great deal of soul searching by educators in the United States. In some quarters the outcries have been quite violent. Though the reevaluation of just where we are in the field of education has been on the whole beneficial, there are those who have used the Soviet achievements in science as a springboard for venting their spleen on American educators and the American educational system in frantic terms. Where they found weaknesses, which there certainly were, they made blanket condemnations. These critics looked at Soviet statistics on the number of students in the engineering and scientific fields and decided that the Federal Government must institute a crash program in this area. While not categorically denying all validity to the arguments of these critics let us look once again briefly at some of these sta-

tistics and view them in the broader aspects of the virtues of the American educational system and its achievements. It will be my contention that improvement of our educational system should not mean an imitation of the Soviet system, but an improvement of the opportunities our system now provides for study in the areas of both science and the humanities in an atmosphere of stern competition and freedom. It is my contention that Federal programs should not encourage the gap between the sciences and the humanities. And finally, I will again present a proposal that I believe will strengthen the virtues of our educational system as it has historically evolved.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States we now have 1,975 institutions of higher learning. The Soviet Union has 760 institutions of higher learning. We have 143 universities compared to 40 in the Soviet Union. The type of educational system of the Soviet Union is reflected in the fact that they have 720 technical institutes compared to 50 technological schools in the United States. Universities and technical schools account for all 760 institutions of higher learning in the Soviet Union. In addition to these, we in the United States have 764 liberal arts colleges, 198 teachers colleges, 176 religious schools, 45 schools of art, 75 other professional schools, and 524 junior colleges.

In the United States, 4,300,000 are enrolled in institutions of higher learning compared to 2.4 million in the Soviet Union.

Granting the fact that the technical institutes of the Soviet Union include areas in teaching and the humanities it is clear from the above figures that we have a much greater freedom of meaningful choice in where and what college to attend. While we cannot overlook the political power advantages the Soviet system has in directing a total system along the lines the leaders have set, neither can we overlook the fact that in our country our principle of freedom of choice in higher education—with a tremendous number of schools to choose from—is a major factor in maintaining an open, dynamic, and free society. While recognizing the importance of science today, let us adhere as closely as possible to our basic premises that under our system of education our young people will freely choose to study and prepare themselves in areas that are vital to the national interest.

When speaking of maintaining our might to defend and promote our high national purpose we should not become immersed in fear and forget that our national purpose is individual freedom. Because of certain political advantages of a single-minded system, I do not think we should lose faith in our citizens' ability to educate themselves in a climate of freedom.

These are some of the considerations that weigh on my mind when thinking of the problems that face us in higher education. These are some of the considerations that have led me to search for a plan of aid to higher education that would be consistent with individual ini-

tiative regardless of wealth or social status; a plan that would protect our diversity of educational opportunity; a plan that would be consistent with our constitutional principle of the separation of church and state; a plan that would be fiscally sound; and finally, a plan that continually builds for the future.

These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the considerations that led me, as I mentioned a week ago, to direct my research team of students at the State University of Iowa law school, under the very able direction of Dr. Diel Wright and Dr. Russell Ross, to make a thorough study and evaluation of the problems confronting higher education. The result of this study and consultation with other authorities in the field of higher education, is the Iowa plan for growth and progress in higher education; in short, the Iowa plan. The Iowa plan has been refined and was reintroduced in this session on January 9, the bill being H.R. 22.

The Iowa plan is a tax credit proposal. Phase I of H.R. 22 would grant a tax credit of \$50 a year for each educational certificate purchased from a local commercial bank, a savings and loan association, or a life insurance company doing business in at least three States.

One certificate a year could be purchased every year for each dependent from age 1 through 18, or graduation from high school, whichever comes first. This educational certificate would be purchases by the parent, guardian, or their written designee whether it be an individual or corporation. Only one certificate for each child could be purchased. The amount of the money paid for educational certificates would be deducted from the purchaser's income tax. For example, a man has three children and buys three certificates, costing him \$150. His total income tax for that year is \$600. He would then deduct the \$150, the amount paid for educational certificates that year, from his total tax bill of \$600 and pay the Federal Government \$450.

These certificates can be used only by the student for the purpose of higher education in an approved institution of higher learning, and only if he maintains his grades. If a certificate is purchased every year from age 1 through 18, a fund of \$900 would be invested in these educational certificates. When you add the interest to this you have a fund of \$1,400. If, for any reason, the student does not enroll in a college within 4 years, or if he does not maintain his grades, the fund of that individual will revert to the Federal Treasury. If the student attends college, this fund will be distributed over a 4-year period. The financial institution holding the funds from purchase of the educational certificates will treat this account as it would any savings account until the child enters college. It would then make payments directly to the particular college for application against tuition, fees, room, and board, and so forth.

Phase II of the Iowa plan would grant a tax credit not exceeding \$100 a year or the actual amount of educational expenses for a full-time student, whichever is less, to the taxpayer sustaining the

major burden of educational expenses for that individual student. This credit then would apply to either the student, his parents or guardian, or their designee in writing. The Secretary would set up a scale of the amount of tax credit for part-time students.

The total amount of the tax credit an individual could receive, applying to his college expenses, with interest, would be approximately \$1,800.

Phase III of the Iowa plan is still in the research stage. Phase III involves the use of the revolving fund accruing from the purchase of educational certificates, an estimated fund of \$20 billion. We are proposing that a State board of approximately 25 members, representing the various interest groups of the State, be set up. The professions, labor, business, finance, the State school board, junior colleges, public and private educational institutions, the board of regents, et cetera, would be represented. This board would be commissioned to keep on top of the educational problems of its particular State and recommend policies to be followed. It would also be empowered to grant loans to colleges for whatever purposes the individual college has a need, if it clearly demonstrates its need and ability to repay the loan. The board would also be permitted to make loans to individual students whose financial situation is such that the tax credit would be insufficient to insure his ability to attend college.

If a loan is approved by the board, a central bank of the State would be directed to grant such a loan from the funds accruing from the purchase of educational certificates. The central bank would inform the individual financial institutions what percent of their deposits they should send to the central bank for such loan, based on an annual audit. Upon repayment of the loan to the central bank, the financial institution would be repaid with interest.

Mr. Speaker, I do not contend that the Iowa plan will mass-produce brilliant scientists. I do not contend that the Iowa plan is a cure-all for our educational ills. I do not contend that it will produce a new American man as the Soviets are trying to produce a new Soviet man. But I do contend that it is a sound and fair proposal that would greatly enhance the opportunities our educational system offers without imposing bureaucratic controls on that system. I do contend that it is a proposal consistent with the goals of democracy and freedom that our great Nation stands for. I do contend that if a potential scientist desires an education this plan will make it possible for him to have one regardless of his wealth or social status. Finally, I contend that it will also permit a student interested in art, in poetry, in history—in the humanities in general—to attend college. I do not think we should forget this area. Of all the dangers of federally controlled higher education, the encouragement of the gap between the sciences and humanities is certainly one of the most perilous.

AN URGENT NEED FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR DAY-CARE SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced appropriation bills which appropriate for fiscal 1963 \$5 million and for fiscal 1964 \$10 million for child day-care services.

Let us first review last year's legislative history concerning this matter. On July 28, 1962, at the time of the enactment of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962—Public Law 87-843—authorizing money for day-care services, Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, Chief of the Children's Bureau, termed the current day-care services a national disgrace, and added:

The supply of good day-care programs is inadequate to meet the need. On a national basis, the quality of day care now being offered is frequently so poor that children who receive it may suffer serious personality damage—if not physical harm.

The President's approval of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 this week gives us a golden opportunity to help the States expand and improve their day-care services, and make life better for the thousands of children who need good care if their mothers must work.

There is urgent need for action. We can see the tangible results of the physical abuses suffered by children in day care. We will be coping for years to come with the intangible results of the damage they are suffering in their most formative years.

Public Law 87-543 authorized \$30 million for fiscal 1963 and \$35 million for fiscal 1964 for child welfare services. In each fiscal year the amount appropriated in excess of \$25 million was to be earmarked for day-care services. Therefore, \$5 million would be allocated to day-care services in fiscal 1963 and \$10 million in fiscal 1964.

The supplemental appropriation bill (H.R. 13290) included the \$5 million for day-care services for fiscal year 1963. It passed the House on October 3, 1962, and the other body on October 11, 1962. Unfortunately, it did not go to a conference before Congress adjourned. I hope that we will be able to appropriate this amount very early in this session.

Mr. Speaker, the need for day-care services has existed for as long as our country has been an industrialized society with mothers working. The need for expanded and improved day-care services is now greater than ever. As early as 1854 in New York City the first day-care services were provided for children whose mothers eked out an existence in domestic service or in the factories. Following this farsighted effort day nurseries came into being all over the country—each one a philanthropic effort on the part of a community. And in 1898 the National Federation of Day Nurseries was organized in Chicago and became a spokesman for the cause of decent day-care facilities.

But, as a publication of the Children's Bureau points out:

Despite these solid beginnings, the expansion of day-care programs has been sporadic. Day care received impetus from the tragedies of the Civil War, World War I, the great depression, and World War II. After each of these events, enthusiasm leveled off.

A solid, federally financed and stimulated program is necessary for adequate nationwide and statewide services to be set up and maintained.

An example of the powerful impetus provided by the investment of Federal funds in this area was the World War II emergency program under the Lanham Act. Two areas, California and New York City, owe most of their existing programs to centers set up under this act and then continued with State and municipal funds.

Mr. Speaker, there are more women in the labor force today than ever before in our Nation's history. There has been a 66-percent increase in the number of working mothers with children under 18 years of age in the past 10 years. There are about 15 million children under 18 years of age whose mothers are working; 4 million of these children are under 6 years of age and 5 million are between the ages of 6 through 11; in addition, there are nearly half a million mother-only families with children under 6 where the mother is the sole support of her family. There are also 117,000 children under 6 living in father-only families.

Moreover, working parents are not alone in need of good daytime supervision for their children. Consider the mother who is ill, the mother living in an overcrowded slum with no play opportunities for her children, the mother with emotionally handicapped or mentally retarded children, the mother in a family with emotional problems.

A 1958 survey of the Bureau of Census revealed that 400,000 children under 12 years of age were completely unsupervised. This figure covers only children whose mothers worked full time, leaving them unsupervised; it does not cover those mothers who worked part time. And in the major public welfare program of aid to dependent children, where one-sixth of the mothers were employed part time or full time, one-seventh of the children of part-time working mothers and one-ninth of the children of full-time working mothers were expected to care completely for themselves in their mothers' absence. Surely decent day-care facilities are just as vital to those mothers and their children as the aid-to-dependent-children payments.

Despite the overwhelming need, the present capacity of all reported licensed day-care facilities is for only 185,000 children.

A sound nationwide day-care program is the objective of the Federal program. Before a State becomes eligible for its share of the day-care appropriation, it must enact a licensing law requiring certain minimum conditions in any licensed facility.

Ultimately this requirement should encourage a high standard of uniformity among State laws and interchange of information among States. To date, 8 States have no licensing laws, and 12 others have only partial control of the licensing authority. The licensing provision does not restrict the allotment of funds to any one kind of facility; Federal money can be used to support either a State or public facility, or a private nonprofit group providing day-care supervision, or a private home where such services are offered.

The law also provides that arrangements be made with State health and public school authorities to assure maximum utilization of such agencies for health care and education for day-care children and for safeguards assuring that day care be provided only where it is in the interest of mother and child.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House take prompt action to provide the \$5 million for day care for this fiscal year and the \$10 million in succeeding years. For New York State, this appropriation could mean \$297,817 this year and \$593,246 in the following year. No child should be permitted to grow up in an environment which lacks warmth and a concern for his development as an individual and constructive human being. We can do our part in improving the environment of the Nation's children by approving these funds for day-care services.

NEED FOR A LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, like the other Members of the House, I was very much interested in the discussions today in regard to the President's budget message. I was particularly appreciative of the suggestions being made for organizing the Congress in a manner in which we can bring about a legislative budget, something that the people of the country are unaware of, I have found out over a period of years. We actually do not have the machinery, or at least have not used the machinery for creating a legislative budget.

Herein lies the reason the Congress has been largely ineffectual in keeping the President's budget in line.

One other remark I may make in regard to setting up the machinery—and this is said in somewhat of a chiding fashion perhaps to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—the Appropriations Committee in the 83d Congress set up a staff that was very adequate, and some \$12 billion was cut off the Truman prepared budget in a detailed fashion. So well was the job done that we heard very few repercussions either on the floor of the House or the Senate during debate or throughout the country. That staff was largely eliminated when Congress changed hands in the 1954 elections. To this day we do not have the kind of staff—the caliber of the individuals on the staff I hasten to re-

mark is excellent—to do the job that must be done if a detailed review of these budget items is to be made. It is only through this kind of detail that we can make this meaningful.

The President has basically changed the format of his budget presentation for 1964 from that of preceding years. This, of course, makes it difficult to compare the previous budgets, and perhaps this is intentional.

If anyone cares to look at the budget for 1963 and compare it with the year 1964, he will see the manner in which the format has been altered, which makes it quite difficult to compare apples with apples and oranges with oranges. We see a great deal of use of apples and oranges and peanuts and pumpkins in going through this.

The language was so carefully selected that I had a doubt in my mind as to just whether it meant what it really said as far as his budget proposals for 1964 were concerned. The truth is now out that the budget requests for 1964 in non-defense expenditures are not down and that the only thing he could have been referring to is the payments-to-the-public budgetary item. If one will note, the only sizable reduction in nondefense payments to the public is in the agricultural and agricultural research sector. For 1963 the estimate was \$6.7 billion and the 1964 estimate is \$5.7 billion; international affairs and finance, 1963 estimate \$2.9 billion, \$2.7 billion for 1964; housing and community development \$0.5 billion in 1963 and \$0.3 billion in 1964. All the other nondefense items are increased. The only reason these increases can be made with the total remaining not greater is because of the cuts essentially in the agricultural sector.

What I have been reading to you is in the forefront of the President's budget and that which has been given to the press and, as emphasized, is not in the budget at all.

Now, however, let us look at the real budget picture in the agricultural sector. Far from a decrease there is a sizable increase. The 1963 obligatory authority of the Department of Agriculture was \$6.7 billion. The request for new obligatory authority in the 1964 budget is \$8.1 billion or an increase of \$1.4 billion.

Incidentally, defense shows in 1963 new obligatory authority of \$49.96 billion, in the 1964 budget \$51.28 billion, or an increase of defense of only \$1.3 billion. So, just agriculture alone in the nondefense sector is a greater increase than that in defense, and I might say, percentage-wise the increase in agriculture is substantially over that of defense. But, let us take another item.

Health, education, and welfare increase in the 1964 obligatory authority goes up \$1.7 billion in the 1964 request. Now, this is important, because the President has been making the statement that the increased budget is in the defense sector. How does one say this forcefully so that the people of this country can understand the techniques that are being used to deceive the peo-

ple? What is going on here? What kind of language can one use that is parliamentary and yet forceful? The obligatory authority, of course, is the test of a budget and what the future expenditures will be, whether they occur actually in the fiscal year for which the requests have been made or not.

A very interesting point in the Department of Agriculture item is to compare the new obligatory authority for 1962, 1963, and 1964 budgets. In 1962 the new obligatory authority was \$7.4 billion, in 1963 \$6.7 billion and in 1964 \$8.1 billion.

Now, go through a little bit of arithmetic with me. Take \$0.7 billion off the 1964 estimate and add that to the 1963 estimate and we will get for all 3 years, 1962, 1963, and 1964, the exact same amount, \$7.4 billion of new obligatory authority, and when we dig into the details of it we begin to see that these are unreal. This is merely putting in some figures.

However, the reason for the discrepancy of the payments-to-the-public aspect of the budget in relation to new obligatory authority lies not in a payment to the public sector in agriculture at all but rather in a sector of which should be receipts from the public.

In other words, there is a juggling of figures here.

The President states:

Federal payments in 1964 for all agricultural programs are estimated at \$5.8 billion, a reduction of \$1.1 billion from the 1963 level. This reduction results largely from anticipated substantial sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation in 1964 of cotton expected to be placed under price support in 1963.

That is from page 21.

The actual amount of these anticipated sales is supposed to be around \$2.5 billion. Now the item of sale of Commodity Credit Corporation should be listed in the Government receipts from the public and Government revenue portions of the budget and yet that item is not there. It is juggling to place this item in the expenditure side by simply reducing payments to the public. Actually expenditures will increase as the new obligatory authority and actual expenditure rates for agriculture show.

This is only one item in this juggled budget that reveals that the President is not cutting expenditure in nondefense area but actually is embarking us upon a continued increase in expenditure levels primarily in nondefense areas which began with the last Eisenhower budget of \$81 billion expenditure request, to an \$87 billion mark for fiscal year 1962, to a \$94 billion mark for fiscal year 1963, and now to something that is well over \$100 billion for fiscal year 1964.

Let it not be forgotten that the 1963 budget, although calling for an expenditure level of \$92.5 billion, actually had requests for obligatory authority of just under \$100 billion. The 1964 budget request for new obligatory authority is \$107.9 billion. This indeed is fiscal irresponsibility. It is a deceitful presentation to the Congress and to the public.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. I recall in the President's state of the Union message that the President observed that many desirable programs must be reduced or postponed. Immediately thereafter the President listed a number of new programs, including mass transit, education, the youth programs—the conservation corps of some sort—medicare, and so forth.

Does the gentleman from Missouri know what those programs might be that the President had in mind that will be reduced or postponed?

Mr. CURTIS. No; and I think it is a question that should be asked the President, because as near as I can figure, everything he has been talking about and at least campaigning on seems to be requested of the Congress to provide the authority, and it is budgeted. I do not know a single thing that the President has actually cut back, or at least as far as his statements are concerned. I find that his statements frequently do not relate to actually what will be in the budget request or indeed in the program that he seeks to push through the Congress.

He has promised a great many things to the people and he still says he is going to produce these things for them. I think many of those items may not be in the budget but at least as far as his statement is concerned they are in the budget.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLODY. Would the program which was advocated here earlier in the day by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] fulfill the need for this legislative investigation of the budget which prevailed in 1954 or prior to 1954 to which the gentleman from Missouri made reference in the gentleman's remarks?

Mr. CURTIS. Requiring the legislative budget? I think it might produce that machinery. Certainly, I have a great respect for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and it is possible that this kind of machinery would produce it. I would say, though, essentially what has to happen is the Committee on Appropriations has to staff itself adequately. And, let me say something else: The Congress should be concerned about this. The President in his budget message has said he is going to ask the Congress almost immediately to increase or to hold the debt limit increase to \$308 billion, which was only temporary. This is going to come before the Committee on Ways and Means, this request that the President needs to have the debt limitation kept at \$308 billion. So, one of the first measures that is going to come on the floor of the House is going to be this issue to deal with this expenditure level. I think the Congress can use that issue as the fulcrum. The Committee on Ways and Means can use its power in this area to review this

overall budget request and probably get some discipline in this area. Let us find out early in this Congress whether or not we are going to follow the fiscal irresponsibility set out in the President's budget or whether we in Congress are going to assume some fiscal responsibility in behalf of the people.

DISPUTE INVOLVING THE AMATEUR ATHLETIC UNION OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, under instructions from President Kennedy, the dispute involving the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States—AAU—and the National Collegiate Athletic Association—NCAA—with Gen. Douglas MacArthur as arbitrator, will get underway tomorrow in New York City. These proceedings are of utmost importance to all of us. They involve no threat of thermonuclear war, or even of brush-fire conflict, yet their success or failure will have a direct bearing on the world prestige of the United States.

This arbitration arises because the United States is currently torn in athletic civil war. Much has been written, much has been said, for the viewpoints of the two competing organizations. Undoubtedly there are areas in which both sides have right and proper contentions, but just as obviously there are areas in which the two competing parties are dead wrong.

The AAU is the affiliated governing body in the United States for track and field and holds the U.S. representative authority in the International Federation and thus the International Olympic Committee, and the NCAA seeks in this particular instance to take this power in field and track. With the backing of the NCAA, a U.S. Track and Field Federation has been formed, which seeks co-sanctioning power with the AAU.

Certainly it would not be in the best interest of these talks for us to try to resolve the differences here, at this time. It could, however, become necessary for Congress to take action in the future should these negotiations fail to resolve what has snowballed into an intolerable situation. It is therefore very fitting, I believe, for us today to admonish those charged with the responsibility of resolving these differences to place individual whims, jealousy, and personal prestige in the background and to put the best interest of our international athletic prestige first in their minds.

Today's global coexistence has become a very complicated affair with tangents that amaze and astound all of us. One of these facets, surprisingly enough, is concerned with athletic competition, not necessarily within our own country but between nations all over the world.

For many of us this interest centers on Olympic years, every quadrennial, when amateur athletes of all countries compete against one another. Gold

medals are awarded, flags are flown, national anthems are resounded, and on the Olympic competition fields, all nations are equal. But there is more to the 4-year Olympic matches than this fanfare and glamor. Olympic committee personnel and working staffs never relax. U.S. athletes and teams compete every season of the year, in a variety of sports, with athletes and teams of other countries. We send athletes and coaches to many nations to assist them in their own programs. These are good-will ambassadors, and it has been shown time and again that international athletic competition is one of the best ways to get the message of the free world directly into the eyes and ears of those who are not certain—citizens of the noncommitted countries, as well as those whose minds are cluttered by half-truths or no-truths about our American way of life.

Some time ago Gary Player, the fine young South African golfer, who won our national PGA championship last summer, made a telling remark about one of our own great golfers, Arnold Palmer, when he said that, in his opinion, the United States has never sent a better ambassador abroad than Arnold Palmer. We cannot, because of the petty differences of two organizations, allow any Arnold Palmers to be left on this side of the Pacific when our Olympic team goes to Tokyo next year for the 1964 Olympics.

And Jim Beatty, the world's finest miler, winner of the Sullivan Award as this country's outstanding amateur athlete of 1962, and a fellow North Carolinian, while recently relating some of his travels to foreign countries, including his trip to the 1962 Olympics in Rome, stated, as many athletes have done, that the people of other nations look up to the American athlete, expect so much from his performance, and watch everything he does.

This is not an Olympic year, true, but the 1964 Olympics are fast approaching. In the late spring of 1963, the United States will compete in the Pan-American Games in Brazil, prior to the 1964 Olympics in Tokyo. These are therefore important and formative months for the American teams which will carry our colors in these international events. Unfortunately, however, some of our outstanding track and field men are not competing in the winter indoor track meets and are therefore missing a competitive season which they sorely need.

I am not attempting to say which of the competing organizations, AAU or NCAA, is right and which is wrong, or even to define the gray areas of the dispute; but as these two groups meet with President Kennedy's distinguished arbitrator, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in New York tomorrow, I am sure it must be concluded that there is room for both groups in our athletic picture. But there is no room for the kind of bickering which has been going on for months—indeed for more than 2 years now. Unless this bickering is ended—and immediately—one of democracy's greatest cold war weapons for peace may be blunted irrevocably. Therefore it behooves the American people to

demand of both the AAU and the NCAA that every effort be directed toward one common cause—the supremacy of the American athlete in this cold war of international competition, which can only be achieved by the best in training, preparation, leadership, organization, and freedom from internal strife.

And to this end, let us fervently hope that tomorrow's conference, and all future sessions, will be dedicated.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a bill authorizing the reopening of the national service life insurance program to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict—which I trust will win the overwhelming approval of this Congress.

It will be recalled that similar legislation became enmeshed in unfortunate complications last year. In justice to those who served their country in time of war the situation should be corrected this year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the principles of equity and fair play support the basic concept embodied in the bill. Briefly, it provides that veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict who did not exercise their right to apply for national service life insurance during their initial period of eligibility, now be given a 1-year period in which to apply for insurance coverage.

The granting of a period of grace to World War II and Korean war veterans would go a long way toward assuring men and women who served in these two conflicts equality of treatment with veterans of World War I. The latter, as it turned out, had 33 years in which to apply for Government insurance based on their service in the Armed Forces of the Nation. By contrast, those who served in the Second World War had only 4½ years, ending April 25, 1951, in which to apply. And those who served in the conflict after that had only 120 days after separation in which to apply. In all fairness, it seems to me, a 1-year period of grace should be granted to the two recent groups of veterans to put them on a more equal basis, with respect to application for NSLI, with World War I veterans.

In asking approval of the period-of-grace principle, I should like to point out that there are many reasons why World War II veterans and Korean veterans who could have applied for NSLI during their initial period of eligibility failed to take advantage of the opportunity. Some veterans suffered readjustment problems that made it difficult for them to get a job or, if they did, to meet the NSLI premium payments. Others were too young at the time of their separation from the service to realize fully the value of life insurance, and simply could not foresee the time when they would be family men, and insurance

would be vital to the security of their wives and children. Still others, at the time of separation, were just getting started in their careers, interrupted by the years of service, but already had families to support on low-paying jobs. Many veterans, for all these reasons, did not apply for NSLI right away. They did not anticipate that their right to apply would be cut off in such a short time as proved to be the case, and they planned to apply later on when it was less difficult for them financially to make payments. Now, as a result of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951—Insurance Act of 1951—Public Law 82-23—and of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivors Benefit Act—Public Law 84-881—these veterans find that they have lost the right to apply for NSLI.

That this right is an extremely valuable one, and not to be taken away lightly, is attested by recent figures supplied by the American Legion, one of the many veterans' organizations that support the basic period-of-grace principle contained in my bill and in other bills submitted in earlier years. These figures show that the cost of NSLI, by comparison with similar commercial policies, is far lower. The average net annual premium charged by four leading commercial insurance firms for 5-year term insurance at age 35 is \$6.64 per \$1,000 of coverage, compared with only \$1.20 for NSLI, for example. There are similar differences in rates—in some cases not as large, but still substantial—for other types of insurance. This means that the loss of eligibility to apply for NSLI represents a considerable loss of equity for veterans who, for any of the reasons enunciated above, failed to take out NSLI during their initial periods of eligibility.

Are we now to continue to deprive veterans of this very valuable right, which they earned by their service in the Armed Forces of this Nation, simply because—as a result of economic hardship or immature judgment, they failed to exercise it immediately? I think the obvious answer to this question is "No."

The bill would not create any new Federal programs or make any new groups of veterans eligible for NSLI. It would simply restore eligibility previously earned by veterans by virtue of their service in the Armed Forces. Second, the bill would not add to Government costs under the NSLI program, since additional costs of administration would be charged to those using the grace period to enter the NSLI program. It is estimated that millions of ex-servicemen—perhaps as many as 14 to 16 million—would have their right to purchase NSLI policies restored if the period-of-grace concept is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I have received dozens on dozens—actually hundreds of letters from people in my district urging favorable action on the period-of-grace principle. As the sponsor of an earlier bill to achieve that end and as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have also received many letters from people outside my district—from all over the country—in favor of the principle.

I have not received even a single letter opposing the period-of-grace approach.

In letter after letter, veterans and others describe their own situations or those of members of their family—either because of economic hardship or immaturity, they failed to take advantage of NSLI eligibility right after leaving the service; then they suddenly found it was too late—before they realized it, they were no longer permitted to purchase NSLI policies. Now they are asking to have their right restored. They are not asking for special benefits; they are not asking for handouts or charity. All they want is a chance to exercise the rights that Congress provided for them and that they earned by their service.

It has been argued that a bill such as this would put the Government in the insurance business and provide a Government subsidy to veterans. I think it is fair to say that these arguments are completely invalid.

With regard to the charge that the bill puts the United States in the insurance business, the fact is that it does not create any new Government programs, does not bring under NSLI coverage a single veteran not previously eligible. All the bill does is permit veterans—for a limited time only—to take advantage of rights that they earned earlier by service in the Armed Forces but did not exercise.

There is, perhaps, one final contention that deserves mention, and that is the Government should not be selling insurance to veterans at all, because this represents competition with private business. Whatever the merits of this contention, it does not involve a question that we are called on to decide in consideration of this bill. The question of whether the Government may "sell" insurance—where Congress decides that the public interest, or solemn commitments to members of the Armed Forces require it—was decided long ago. I should like to point out that Congress, in 1935, in the Social Security Act, set up the old-age and survivors insurance system and established the Federal-State unemployment insurance system, and the U.S. Government has been in the insurance business ever since. And with regard to this very bill that I have submitted, Congress years and years ago established the principle that war veterans should be eligible to purchase insurance at cost from the Government.

In conclusion, let me say again that this bill does not propose establishing any new Federal program, it does not attempt to make eligible anyone who was not formerly eligible; it does not put the Government in the insurance business, for the simple reason that NSLI is already long established; it does not give anyone a handout because all costs will be entirely covered by the premiums. All that the bill does is to extend simple equality of treatment to World War II and Korean veterans—in relation to World War I veterans—by granting them a period of grace in which they may take up rights, guaranteed by Congress, which they did not exercise.

To repeat, Mr. Speaker, a comment I made earlier: I believe that the principles of equity and fair play most strongly support the basic period-of-grace concept enunciated in this bill.

ELIMINATION OF RESTRICTIONS ON RESIDUAL OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the complete and immediate elimination of restrictions on residual oil imports.

Residual oil supplies the heat for most large buildings in New England and the east coast.

It heats our hospitals, our industrial buildings; it is used by our manufacturers to produce process steam; it is used by many electric utilities to produce the electric power which is the lifeblood of our economy. Most of New England, New York State, New Jersey, and the east coast down to Florida are dependent upon residual as an energy source. Sixty percent of the United States consumption in 1960 was along the east coast. Its use is rising gradually while the output from domestic refineries feeding the east coast has been dropping steadily. At the present time, less than 37 percent of the requirements for the east coast is produced by domestic refiners. It is only natural, therefore, that imports for consumption have increased to make up the difference. Imports represented one-third of consumption in 1949 to two-thirds in 1960. About half of the total imports come into the New York-New Jersey area and about a third of this amount of 33 million barrels a year each comes into the Boston and Philadelphia areas.

Residual oil is an essential raw material for our economy which is not produced domestically in sufficient quantities to meet the demand. It is ridiculous to impose restrictions on imports of this vital product.

The oil import administration has juggled quotas for 3 years. Under rigid controls instituted in 1960, prices skyrocketed. Under more liberal controls initiated a year ago, prices dropped somewhat, but they still have not dropped to the free world price for this oil. Currently oil sold outside of the program—bonded oil—is being sold on the east coast at \$2.10 a barrel. The same oil sold domestically under the program—nonbonded—commands a price of \$2.33 a barrel. Perhaps those who administer the import program think this is an unimportant difference, but I am told this additional 23 cents a barrel is costing the east coast over \$73 million annually.

In a speech before the American Petroleum Institute, the Honorable John M. Kelly, Assistant Secretary of Interior for Mineral Resources, stated that:

The control program was a bulwark of stability in an unstable petroleum world and that the ultimate cost, if any, to the consumers are cheap insurance for national security, and an adequate consumer supply.

Mr. Speaker, I would be mighty interested in learning how the additional cost to the east coast of over \$73 million annually strengthens our national security.

The question of import controls on residual oil has been under study by the Office of Emergency Planning for 2 years. It is their job to determine the national security aspects of imports. Their failure to reach a conclusion to this date is persuasive evidence that there are no pressing national security considerations involved in the importation of residual oil. It would seem to me that in our global defense strategy, the ability to draw on petroleum supplies from several sources outside the United States might be an important advantage.

My colleagues in the coal-producing States may take violent exception to my remarks, but in spite of their best efforts they have failed to demonstrate that this program has had any significant effect on employment in the bituminous coal industry. In the first 10 months of 1962, bituminous coal production increased 5.4 percent over 1961 and during the same period employment in the industry is down. After 3 years of controls on residual oil imports, the situation of the unemployed coal miner has not been materially assisted by such restrictions.

At this very moment there is a shortage of residual oil building up which is about to become critical. To support this contention let me point out that: first, importers have had to borrow against their first quarter quotas to the extent of 3½ million barrels in order to supply their needs for the last quarter of 1962; and, second, the spot market for residual oil disappeared about 2 months ago and the trade press has, each day, drawn attention to the fact that the market is tight and getting tighter. The ultimate result, of course, is price increases which were announced within recent weeks by two major suppliers in the Philadelphia area and one in New York City.

And, at the very moment when we are trying to do our utmost to bring about hemispheric solidarity with our South American neighbors, in spite of our solemn promises at Punta del Este last year, we continue to slap our Venezuelan neighbors in the face.

Venezuela lives from oil exports. Because of its low gravity, crude oil residual represents 57 percent of the total output of refined products in that country. In the Netherlands Antilles, a major refining center for Venezuelan crudes, residual represents 48 percent of the total refined products. Many of these crudes have little or no other value than for residual.

Residual, then, to these countries is a major product, not a waste byproduct. The United States is the most natural and important market outlet.

The Venezuelans are aware of the fact that import controls on residual oils were not instituted to protect the domestic oil industry; they know too much about the U.S. oil industry to even consider such a ridiculous proposal. The Venezuelans know that the importation into the United States of their residual

oil has no bearing on our national security. They know that unemployment in the coal mining regions is caused by technological improvements, increased output per man, the loss of the home heating market and the conversion of the railroad industry from coal burning steam locomotives to diesel. The Venezuelans must think that we are stupid when they see consumers of their oil in this country, paying more for fuel than consumers in other countries; countries which do not have the energy resources that the United States does.

In closing, I would like to quote from a recent editorial in the Boston Herald addressed to the oil import program:

What sort of a system is this that does our fuel to us in hand-to-mouth barrels per day?

What sort of a system is it that takes a Nation's high cost fuel area, New England, and spikes it with higher costs by an artificial shortage of one of its most important energy sources?

What sort of a system is it that makes the Government the sole regulator of the market for this commodity, restricting rations, and with wartime severity?

What kind of a system is it that says we must use coal when we want to use oil, and where has New England failed that it cannot bring to play for justice and fairness the pressures on a Government that the coal States can bring for injustice and unfairness. There must be complete elimination of restrictions on residual oil imports. Quotas, no matter how carefully prescribed, dislocate the market, push up prices, and unjustifiably interfere with New England's right to choose its own fuels.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the present President, when a Member of the Senate, signed a petition to President Eisenhower asking for just the kind of relief that is sought here?

Mr. MORSE. I recollect that he did so.

Mr. WYMAN. May I inquire whether the action that is sought here, that is, relief for New England, may be obtained by Executive order?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WYMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts know whether anyone has asked the President whether or not he has changed his mind?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry I do not have the facts at hand, but I think it might be an appropriate thing to be done.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURKE. Is it not true that in 1961 relief was given by the President in this respect?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I think all of us hailed his action, but I think we all recognize, and I am sure our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, would recognize, that even further relief is needed, and I think if he will join with me in urging complete elimination of residual oil import

restrictions would give the further relief that is needed.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I wish to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts. I may say that all of the New England delegation has been deeply concerned about this problem ever since import restrictions were imposed. I want to ask the gentleman, if in his opinion, as he has evaluated the impact of this restriction on the New England economy, if it is a fact that after having operated under this limitation since its imposition in 1959, if I remember correctly, that the New England economy has absorbed millions of dollars of costs which has been inequitable in relation to our competitive situation and inequitable by virtue of this imposition, and that if the New England economy has not now reached a point where the continuation of this inequity is indeed a most serious burden upon every element of our economy which is dependent upon these types of fuel.

Mr. MORSE. I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from Maine. I might add I have been told that the cost borne by the New England consumers amounts to some \$30 million a year as a direct result of the restriction program. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the distinguished Member from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] on his able and scholarly discussion of the impact of residual oil quotas on the New England States and desire to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE]. Every person living in New England is directly effected by the unrealistic and unfair restrictions on imports of residual fuel oils.

Unless import quotas on residual fuel oils are removed, industry will be severely penalized, and there will be more unemployment. Electricity bills to individual consumers will rise, and hospitals and institutions will be adversely affected.

Allow me to cite one isolated example of one firm in the State of Maine employing 500 people and contributing indirectly to the livelihood of over 2,500 people. This industry uses 350,000 barrels of residual fuel oil per year; 10 percent of its gross sales go toward the

purchase of fuel oil. This company is highly respected in its field, but is operating in the red. Unless import quotas on residual fuel oils are lifted so that costs can be reduced, there will be layoffs and eventually this plant will close. Maine cannot afford to lose jobs; on the contrary we are making every effort to attract more industry to our State and create more job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that every Member of Congress from New England will make himself heard in righteous protest on this matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with my colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman MORSE, in the remarks which he has made today on the question of residual oil import restrictions and their impact upon the economy of New England. He has ably presented arguments which are shared by all of us from the six New England States.

The mandatory quota program must be eliminated before it destroys an important part of the New England business community, undermines the economic growth of our region and continues to exact a heavy penalty from the consumers of our States.

I should like to comment on one particular aspect of the residual oil import quota program which I believe to be especially significant. The economy of my State was built upon the foundation of small, free, independent enterprise. We are proud of the Yankee craftsmen who through their own efforts have been able to fashion successful small business enterprise in our region. Indeed, the Congress has expressed over and over again its deep concern with the maintenance of an economic climate which encourages the growth of small independent businesses.

Before the quota program was put into effect, there were 10 independent heavy fuel oil marketers in the 6 New England States. As of today, there are only three. One by one they have been taken over by large integrated oil companies for the prime purpose of picking up their import quota tickets. The marketers have become prisoners of the large international oil companies. The marketers find in many cases that their supplier is selling residual oil in the area they serve at lower retail prices than they are able to buy at wholesale and, because of the rigidity of the quota program, they are unable to take their business to any other supplier. This is monopoly in its most insidious form—monopoly created by the Federal Government for the benefit of a very few importers, whose quotas are based on the mere accident of the amount of oil they happened to import in the year 1957.

This quota program must be eliminated before the last remaining independent

businesses in the New England petroleum industry are swallowed up by the international giants.

I am also reliably informed by many users of residual oil in New England that the quota program has eliminated all competition among sellers. Buyers are locked in with their historical supplier and have no opportunity to approach new sources. We have innumerable reports of requests for bids on annual oil requirements which are answered by only one supplier. This is very poor purchasing procedure and has been consistently complained of here in Washington by the General Services Administration, which has been unable to get competition when it advertises the requirements of the Federal Government.

Thus the residual oil import program is making a mockery of our competitive free enterprise system. It is totally inconsistent with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which was backed in a very substantial manner by the Congressmen and Senators from the New England States. It has created a Government-sponsored monopoly which threatens to eliminate competition in the distribution of residual oil throughout New England. The effects of this, Mr. Speaker, will be to place upon the homeowners and consumers of our region a heavy and unnecessary penalty.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter yesterday that made me very proud. It made me proud to have proof that individual Americans are still jealous enough of their personal liberties and their independence and still concerned enough about public principles to speak out in their defense. In the present atmosphere of the city of Washington, it took courage to write this letter, and I am glad to be able to read it here. It is addressed to the Democratic Inaugural Anniversary Committee, Washington, D.C.:

SILVER SPRING, Md.,

January 9, 1963.

DEMOCRATIC INAUGURAL ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This refers to the invitation I received to attend the Second Inaugural Salute, on January 18, 1963.

In the absence of any other logical source of the information, I must assume that my name was obtained either from the Civil Service Commission or from the rolls of the agency in which I am employed. In either case I consider this a politically inspired infringement on the career service.

Notwithstanding the legal aspects of the procedure, and there remains some question of its legality, I feel that it is morally wrong both for the administration to ask for the information, and for the agency to divulge it. We are accustomed to brinkmanship in the cold war negotiations. This, too, is a form of brinkmanship, on the thin line between right and wrong; between legality and nonlegality. It is not conducive to confidence in the national leadership.

Within this purview I must protest the action, and decline the invitation to attend the salute.

Respectfully,

JOHN E. DURRETT.

Mr. Speaker, if the author of this letter or any other civil servant who refuses to pay tribute to the administration's war chest should suffer any discrimination as a result, I pledge myself to the fullest extent that it is possible for me to do so, to come to his or her defense. More than that, I call upon every Member of the Congress, regardless of party, to sustain the civil service principle by assuring all Government employees that they will be protected from any sort of political recrimination in this or any other fund drive by this or any other administration.

THE LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE

Mr. Speaker, the President last night took official cognizance of the crippling and tragic longshoreman strike presently affecting all of our Atlantic and gulf coast ports.

This strike has resulted in serious economic dislocation in the entire country. Its effects are growing daily and I hesitate to forecast the final cost to this Nation's economy and well-being. In my own sixth district of Maryland, the unfortunate plight of our business community is becoming more serious day by day. Industries that have oversea commitments are unable to secure shipment of their goods, and must transfer their orders to foreign subsidiaries and in many cases completely lose the business to distant competitors. It is becoming apparent that the longshoremen's strike is resulting in permanent reduction in oversea sales of U.S. industry. The damaging effects of this stark reality are incalculable—corporate incomes are affected, tax payments to the Federal Government will decrease not to mention the detrimental effect this type of strike is having on our balance-of-payments problem. This is an intolerable contradiction of the spirit of the Trade Expansion Act enacted last year. It is making it impossible for American business to compete in the marketplace or the road.

Those industries producing consumer goods are especially affected as they are confronted with the fact that when their merchandise is not available to the consumer the buyer is forced to purchase competitive products and the lost sale may never be regained. In addition, the consumer is, to some extent, a creature of habit, who finds himself making purchases through other distributing outlets and is loath to change back again, particularly when the dealers have supplied him during a period of emergency.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation cannot afford a continuation of this ruinous longshoremen's strike. Citizens from one end of the country to another are embittered and angered to see a disruption in our economy of the present magnitude. In every sense of the word, the longshoremen tieup is a paralysis strike and its detrimental consequences are tragic and far reaching.

I also note with increasing alarm that in our Nation's largest city, New York,

the public has been without the benefit of daily newspapers for nearly 2 months. The hardship visited upon the millions of New Yorkers is appalling, and the damage to shops, businesses, and laborers in allied industries can never be accurately determined. As our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], noted some weeks ago:

In a democracy which depends on an informed citizenry, any such prolonged stoppage of the steady flow of news and opinions to the people of our greatest city is indeed a matter of deep concern.

Mr. Speaker, I reemphasize the concern expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. But the time has come for more than expressions of concern. The time has come to exert wise and forceful leadership to eliminate from the American scene the tragic resort to the paralysis strike as an economic instrument. This Nation can no longer afford a strike affecting millions of disinterested people, labor and management alike, all suffering in the consequences of total and far-reaching work stoppages.

I can recall several years ago—and I remember it because of the coincidence that on the same date Governor Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, and Mr. Justice Goldberg, prior to the time that he was Mr. Secretary Goldberg, and when he was in fact the general counsel of the AFL-CIO, both stated that the day of the paralysis strike as an economic weapon in America was past. If contemporary collective bargaining techniques are incapable of solving present-day union-management contract deliberations without insupportable national cost, then it is time to search for a new rule of law to provide the solution for these severe industrial controversies.

While President Kennedy has appointed a special arbitration board to attempt to resolve the Longshoremen's strike, the President himself admits it is only an attempt to solve this one strike. There is no long-term, or permanent answer to the paralysis strike in the President's proposal. While it may achieve positive results this one time, and I sincerely hope it does, the newspaper strike continues. The contract deliberations in the railroad industry are just around the bend and missile defense contractors are similarly confronted with approaching serious contract negotiations.

Current collective bargaining methods are today at the conference table proving themselves inadequate to cope with important contract negotiations.

It is, furthermore, sad commentary on American collective bargaining to note that the Executive Office of the President is increasingly utilized as the cure-all for the paralysis strike. This is not free collective bargaining at work, it is not the private deliberations that have until now admirably pervaded the area of contract negotiations, it is not the impartial rule of law that has been the hallmark of our American labor movement. Rather it is a solution by Executive fiat, coercion; it is a strike-to-strike reaction to the intransigence of the bar-

gaining parties. And as such, this approach to serious controversy is not only disjointed and disorganized, it is a dangerous and only temporary alleviation of the crippling paralysis strike.

Because of these facts, Mr. Speaker, and due to my sincere belief that America cannot continue to undergo the drastic economic dislocation in both labor and industry occasioned by such strikes, I am today calling upon the President of the United States to immediately appoint a National Committee of Inquiry to investigate without delay the adequacy of existing law and collective bargaining techniques and the means to restore the benefits of free collective bargaining to the American economy—divorced from blighting effects. I am suggesting that the President appoint to this Committee representatives of labor, management, government, and also, essentially, representatives of the public interest.

I call upon the President to establish this Committee with an urgency of purpose and in expectation of definitive action to resolve the growing impasse of labor and management at the bargaining table. Lasting solution to the national danger of paralysis strikes must be found before we are confronted with another of such drastic economic loss to this Nation.

IMPROVING METROPOLITAN PLANNING

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the rapid growth of metropolitan areas in the United States makes it increasingly important that public planning and development within these areas be as thorough and well coordinated as possible.

To facilitate such coordination—to avoid the waste of resources, loss of time, intergovernmental conflict, and other obstacles which lack of coordination breeds—I am today introducing legislation providing for review of Federal grant applications by metropolitan planning agencies. This modest requirement will, I believe, help make possible the more effective utilization of Federal grant-in-aid assistance to States and communities.

I am especially pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that an identical bill is also being introduced today by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], who has contributed so much to the solution of metropolitan area problems as chairman of the housing subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

The need for such legislation has been well documented by the report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on "Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas." This bill is designed to implement one of the re-

port's recommendations. It is intended to encourage the formation of metropolitan planning agencies and to provide through them an effective means of relating locally initiated programs and projects to the development of the metropolitan area as a whole. It is a well-known fact that many Federal grant projects in the past have been approved and completed without any reference to other Federal, State, and local programs or to their impact on the overall metropolitan region they are designed to serve.

The bill provides, Mr. Speaker, that effective July 1, 1965, applications for Federal grants-in-aid for hospital construction, airport construction, water supply facilities, waste treatment works, urban highways, public housing, and urban renewal be reviewed and commented upon—but not necessarily approved—by an official metropolitan planning agency in the area within which the assistance is to be used.

This requirement would in no way change Federal, State, or local laws which now govern such grant-in-aid programs. Rather, it would assure that consideration is given by the agencies and governments concerned to the need for proper coordination of interrelated development programs in any given metropolitan area. It would assure that the proper interests of the area as a whole are considered before the Federal Government underwrites, in whole or in part, a project in one part of that area.

This bill is a slightly revised version of the bill (H.R. 11797) which I introduced in the 87th Congress. As recommended by the Advisory Commission, it was adopted without dissent by members representing all levels of government, Federal, State, and local. The 1962 Convention of the National Association of Counties formally voted to support enactment of the legislation, as did the board of directors of the National Housing Conference. The American Institute of Planners, as well as other public and private organizations, political scientists and urban planning authorities have expressed their support of this legislation.

MAINTENANCE OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that I hope might offer some help toward solving part of the unemployment problem here in our land caused by automation and mergers.

It is a bill that I call the Maintenance of Employment Act of 1963 and it offers an incentive or financial inducement to all employers that can be certified as maintaining their employee levels at the figures of July 1, 1962, without further abatement through mechanization or mergers. This financial inducement would be through cheaper rates of in-

terest on borrowed money to those employers with enough human interest to try and retain their employees such as locomotive firemen and coal mine workers that are now slated to become victims of "the great pagan god of efficiency" unless something is done.

My approach is through a proposed amendment to the Federal banking laws and my bill would come under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee, the one on which I am serving. If this is not the right approach or the best approach, then a study should be made by Congress looking toward a solution of this immense problem that is caused by our modern all-out worship of an efficiency that constantly destroys human values.

I hope many Members of Congress will study my bill and will become concerned about one of the greatest problems of 1963, the displacement of human beings by metal machines and maneuvering men.

ACQUISITION OF VETERANS HOSPITALS IN KENTUCKY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, the United Mine Workers of America has four modern, efficient, and practically new hospitals in eastern Kentucky at Hazard, McDowell, Middlesboro, and Whitesburg which are now up for sale. Only one of them is in my own congressional district, but all of them are in very strategic places to serve many war veterans in Kentucky, West Virginia, Virginia, and Tennessee areas.

I have been informed that the Veterans' Administration has been making some plans to increase its hospital beds in Kentucky, and I suppose this is also true in the other States mentioned.

Today I have introduced a bill in Congress directing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate a procurement of these very hospitals for the benefit of our veterans needing medical and hospital care. This would be an efficient way to take care of a great need for more hospital facilities, particularly in a part of the country where many of our veterans are unable to meet hospital and doctor bills. The enactment of this bill would do more good among people of greatest need than a medicare law, and I hope the Veterans Affairs Committee will give it suitable attention and recommend it for passage. It would hardly cost a fractional part of what will be spent on foreign aid this year, yet the small cost of it would all be upon American aid for American patriots.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a proposal, H.R. 388, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a tax credit for the purchase of health insurance for persons 65 years of age or over. This bill is an amended version of the proposal which I introduced in the last Congress, and I am sure that these revisions will be looked upon as desirable improvements.

It is true that the existing provisions of the Internal Revenue Code provide a tax deduction available to the elderly for the cost of health insurance, but let me explain briefly why it is necessary to amend the code so as to provide for a tax credit rather than a deduction from reportable income.

The benefit provided by present provisions of the code vary greatly from one taxpayer to another, depending on the income tax bracket of the taxpayer entitled to the deduction. For instance, an elderly person in a very high income tax bracket is in a position to charge off most of the premium he pays, and, similarly, a son in a relatively high income tax bracket actually may pay only a small part of the cost of the protection on a dependent parent.

On the other hand, the benefit afforded by a tax deduction may be relatively small, possibly only 20 percent of the cost of the protection if the taxpayer is in a low income tax bracket. Since the elderly individuals who need assistance in meeting their medical and hospital needs are in the low tax brackets or pay no income tax at all, it would appear that the present tax-deduction method works in the wrong direction in that it is of most help to those who are best able to provide their own coverage.

Recognizing the need which exists for reducing the burden of health costs which so often falls upon many of our Nation's older citizens, and noting the inadequacy of present medical deduction provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, I am offering my tax credit plan to stimulate voluntary health insurance coverage of the Nation's aged population.

The tax credit principle is the central theme of the plan embodied in my proposal. Under terms of my bill, H.R. 388, premiums up to \$150 paid for a health insurance policy for an elderly person could be taken as a credit on the income tax of the person paying the premium. In the event the elderly person does not have a tax of that amount, he would be issued a Treasury certificate which could be used to purchase appropriate insurance coverage. The tax credit would also be available to a close relative who might purchase the insurance coverage for a dependent elderly person.

Provisions of this bill would place an income limitation on the availability of the tax credit. Application of the plan would be restricted to the elderly citizen whose annual income does not exceed \$4,000 or \$8,000 in combined income

with his spouse in the last taxable year. These limits will eliminate from coverage about 2.5 million persons whose incomes exceed the stated amounts. The savings realized by limiting the plan to those of lower incomes makes it possible to increase the tax credit per individual to \$150 from the \$125 figure which would have been available under the proposal which I introduced in the last Congress.

Benefit standards are set forth in the bill spelling out the minimum coverages of health insurance which would be certified as acceptable under the plan. The policy must be of a noncancellable nature, and must provide protection without regard to any preexisting health condition. Hospital room and board would be covered at a rate equal to the hospital's customary charges for semi-private accommodations for a period not to exceed 90 days in any 1 calendar year. This plan will cover both hospital and medical and would provide for payment of \$5 for each doctor call up to \$75 in any 1 year.

The problem of medical and hospital costs for our elderly citizens is a very real one; and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if it is found necessary to provide a 7-percent investment credit for large corporations in order to get our country moving again, then it would follow as a matter of course that our needy old folks should merit consideration of their just requirements. In our haste to move, let us not leave our elder citizens behind. They have made great investments in our Nation's strength and prosperity, so let us recognize their contribution with credit for what they have done.

And let us not discriminate against any of our aged by limiting any health plan to those who are eligible for social security benefits. The plan I am offering would afford help to those who need the help—it would include those who do not even have the benefit of social security payments. On the other hand, the social security approach would provide benefits regardless of the wealth of the individual while ignoring several million needy citizens who do not have social security coverage.

RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported that the Department of Defense proposes to curtail its Reserve officer training in the schools and, at a saving of \$5 million, eliminate entirely the voluntary high school ROTC program.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am shocked at the suggestion. Clearly, if there ever was one, this is a case of being penny-wise and pound foolish. We spend billions upon incomprehensible billions of dollars each year on unmanned, auto-

mated, inhuman instruments of wholesale death and destruction. Yet someone feels compelled to economize when it comes to a time-honored program that not only gives this Nation a leadership Reserve in times of need, but which teaches our young men invaluable lessons of patriotism, discipline, and a sense of personal achievement and responsibility.

I have written Secretary McNamara protesting this proposal, and I take this opportunity to call the matter to the attention of my colleagues and urge that they join in this protest. In this regard, I am glad that I am able to report at this point that hearings before the House Armed Services Committee have already been requested.

Most of us recognize that the Congress must cut needless Government spending wherever possible. This is particularly true if there is to be a tax cut. Unfortunately, however, it very often seems that the more questionable projects of Government are the last to go, while some of our most cherished institutions are razed in the name of economy.

New Bedford High School, the largest high school in my district, has had an ROTC unit since World War I and, before that, a cadet corps dating back to the 1880's. High School Principal John F. Gracia and Principal Emeritus Allison R. Dorman are two of those who have written to me in opposition to the Defense Department proposal. New Bedford has found the ROTC program a most important part of the curriculum over the years. In fact, 15 years ago the program was considered so worthwhile that the entire ROTC schedule was incorporated within the schoolday, so that now New Bedford cadets have three periods of classroom instruction and two drill periods each week. During the winter the drill periods are used for physical training.

Principal Gracia has asked how we can justify the abandonment of such an important program for youth. I would like to quote from his letter:

In these trying times in which we live and in which we are all endeavoring to train our youth to become loyal Americans, it is difficult to understand and certainly difficult to explain to them that ROTC, which teaches them citizenship, leadership, loyalty, responsibility, and love of country, is to be scrapped to save \$5 million in a proposed military budget of \$50 billion—to say nothing of the approximate \$4 billion proposed for foreign aid.

There are many aspects of the voluntary high school ROTC program that merit consideration, not the least of which is the physical training, which has been stressed, of course, by the President on many occasions. Another example of the general worth of the program is the fact that in order for a boy to earn his commission he not only has to meet military requirements but has to earn community service points as well. This, like many of the benefits of the program, is not always apparent at first glance and certainly the dollar value is a hard thing to pin down.

The Secretary of Defense has been quoted as indicating that there is no real

military value to the high school program. I would disagree with this statement very strongly. The fact is that the program has a true national value and it would be very regrettable if it were abandoned at a time when there is such a great need for the type of training it is now providing our youth in some 250 high schools throughout the land. I hope and trust that the House Armed Services Committee will recommend to the Congress—and that the Congress will, in turn, advise the Secretary of Defense—to retain or, better still, strengthen this worthy program.

PERSONAL PROPERTY DONATION PROGRAM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to extend the personal property donation program to certain recreation agencies. These include State and local park, recreation, and public monument agencies, as well as fish and wildlife agencies. To be eligible they must be public, tax-supported activities.

Such agencies presently have the right, along with many other activities, to acquire real property when surplus to Federal needs. Price of such real property is determined according to the circumstances in each case.

This bill would extend to recreation-type public agencies the additional right to receive surplus Federal personal property. It is sought by various agencies and groups, including the National Conference on State Parks.

In his state of the Union message to Congress, the President pointed out that our recreation facilities are already overcrowded. He added:

If we do not plan today for the future growth of these and other great natural assets—not only parks and forests but wildlife and wilderness preserves, and water projects of all kinds—our children and their children will be poorer in every sense of the word.

At present only education, public health, and civil defense agencies are eligible for personal property. I urge that recreation agencies be considered for inclusion in the personal property program.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of the 87th Congress

I repeatedly called the attention of the House to problems that exist within the Federal Aviation Agency, to breakdown in that Agency's air route traffic controls, and to what I consider delinquencies on the part of the FAA Administrator, Mr. Najeeb Halaby.

Mr. Halaby and I have had some rather heated exchanges in the past year. This is perhaps unfortunate since it has led some to believe that our differences are merely personal in nature. This is not the case, as I have tried to document in over a dozen extensions of my remarks on this subject.

Since we adjourned the 87th Congress, I find, as I am sure you have found, that there is a growing concern over the inadequacies of our air safety systems and over the Agency that is responsible for them. This concern has been registered from several quarters and I propose that we should examine these during this session.

Yesterday there came to the newsstands the January 19, 1963, edition of the Saturday Evening Post. This respected journal has never to my knowledge been characterized as wild-eyed or irresponsible in its editorial opinions. Therefore, when this journal speaks editorially about the delinquencies of Mr. Najeeb Halaby, it should be worthy of the attention of the Members. When the Post says, "The FAA's Administrator, Najeeb Halaby, has sounded off before without knowing the facts," I, of course, welcome this further support for a viewpoint I have repeatedly urged in this House.

So that you might have all of this editorial comment before you, I am herewith submitting for the RECORD the editorial in full:

WE NEED MORE SAFETY IN THE AIR

A huge jet crashed into Jamaica Bay, carrying 95 people to their death. The Civil Aeronautics Board, under its statutory authority, launched a long and arduous investigation. The tortuous investigative trail traced by Trevor Armbrister led at length to the Eclipse-Pioneer Division of the Bendix Corp. in Teterboro, N.J., after CAB's Wesley Cowan had detected telltale tweezer marks on the sleeving and wires of a gadget called a servo, precisely like the marks on the wiring of the ill-fated flight 1.

Conforming to requirements, the CAB relayed Cowan's findings to the Federal Aviation Agency, which sent messages to carriers operating 707's, suggesting that neither the yaw damper nor the automatic pilot be used below 5,000 feet until more conclusive information could be obtained. Incredibly the FAA, after testing a different type aircraft—the 720—subsequently decided that the damaged wires were not significant.

The public is constantly told that air travel is as safe as driving a car down the street. Statistics are dredged up in droves to prove the point. All things considered, air travel is remarkably safe. But the point is irrelevant to the fate of flight 1. The 95 people who died in the mudflats of Jamaica Bay will not be helped by all the flight-safety statistics or all the safe arrivals and departures in the world. The public has a right to expect that no one shall die needlessly.

The failure of the manufacturer and the carrier to discover the defective servo is regrettable. The servo unit never should have left the Bendix plant. Once it was installed in the 707, it should have been detected by the carrier. Admiral Rickover has indicated

a shocking statistic. "About 10 percent of commercial airplane accidents," he says, "are traceable to poor quality control during maintenance." There is no excuse for this kind of shoddy maintenance.

Once the American 707 had crashed into Jamaica Bay, the Federal Aviation Agency should have done everything in its power to facilitate the investigation, instead of issuing premature and ill-informed statements about the cause of the crash and refusing to require a mandatory check on servo units. The FAA's Administrator, Najeeb Halaby, has sounded off before without knowing the facts.

Trevor Armbrister's visit to the tower at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport, the Nation's busiest airport, points up another major problem of U.S. aviation. The men in the crucial traffic-control posts at major U.S. airports work under incredible pressure—pressure that sooner or later is bound to produce mistakes, simply because men are human.

Yet anyone who asks the FAA about the pressure on traffic-control personnel is blandly told that the FAA is aware of the problem and it has evolved a system of switching key personnel every 2 or 3 hours to posts where the pressure is not so intense. In theory this sounds good, but it is far from actual practice. The FAA is sincere in its concern, but directives are issued and little or nothing ever comes of them. Switching occurs today in some pressure posts, but it is haphazard and unscheduled. At Washington National Airport, right under the FAA's nose, traffic-control personnel work 8-hour stretches. Half the time they eat their sandwiches on the job. There is no lunch break for traffic-control personnel except on an erratic basis when traffic is light. No one should work 8 hours in such a post without a break.

In a celebrated incident last year a traffic controller at Washington National Airport made a mistake that might easily have caused a major disaster. He did not make a note of an altitude change. As a result, for 42 minutes two aircraft were circling in the same flight path at the same altitude over Springfield, Va. The controller, who was handling nine aircraft at the time and who had worked for 9 years without making a mistake, was blamed and was removed to a less active post.

It might have been more relevant to blame the system. There is hardly a man in the world who will not make one mistake in 9 years, especially if he works under heavy pressure. The real problems of traffic control are the need for more precision instruments and the assignment of greater numbers of qualified personnel to traffic-control towers and centers. Idlewild Airport, for example, is supposed to have 51 journeymen controllers, but in actuality it has only half that number. Important radar handoff posts at many of our airports are tendered by personnel who double in other jobs.

Mr. Halaby likes to boast to Congress that he has cut FAA personnel. He has been known to walk into a traffic-control center and announce with a sweeping gesture to the men who worked there, "Some of you won't be here the next time I come," leaving a badly shattered staff in his wake. Economy is a virtue if wisely achieved, but the real problem, as congestion around our big airports approaches the saturation point, is not to save money but to save lives. What we need is bolder and more effective leadership to see to it that we have the personnel and the precision equipment demanded by the times.

SOVIET STRATEGY ON THE HIGH SEAS—GRAB FOR NARROW WATERS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my studies of the problems of the Caribbean, in which the control of the Panama Canal is a key element, I have long been impressed by the fact that efforts to wrest jurisdiction of that waterway from the United States have been contemporaneous with movements to gain dominion over other strategic water routes.

An informative article on this subject by Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, which was published in the December 21, 1962, issue of *Life*, is commended for reading by every Member of the Congress and by those officials in the executive branch of our Government concerned with the safeguarding of the vital interests of our country.

The article follows:

NEW SOVIET STRATEGY OF THE HIGH SEAS: THE GRAB FOR NARROW WATERS

(By James D. Hittle¹)

The sea, beautiful and rich and useful, is also a source of danger. For the moment, at least, the great powers seem to have stopped fighting bloody battles on her surface with shells or even torpedoes. And the advent of long-range nuclear bombers and 18,000-mile-per-hour missiles flashing through space has diverted attention from the sea as a major battlefield in the classic sense. But the ocean remains a crucial factor in the defense of any nation whose shores are lapped by salty water.

The United States knows this well and has proved it with its fleet of Polaris submarines roaming the world with a nuclear deterrent that the enemy cannot keep in sight. The use of naval power to blockade Cuba and force the Soviet withdrawal of missiles is an immediate case in point.

But it is becoming increasingly and ominously clear that it is that old landlubber, the Soviet Union, that is now making the greatest strides in conquering the sea and that she is setting out, with tremendous energy and characteristic cunning, to turn it to her own use.

There is one shrewd project in particular which the Soviets seem to be pressing ahead on. This, as the map above shows, involves a long-range scheme to gain control over the narrow waters of the world—that is, the key strategic corridors of the sea through which much of the world's shipping must pass. Some of the Soviet moves along this line are on the surface and already obvious. Other moves are more subtle and still inconclusive. If the scheme is carried out to its logical conclusions, it would provide a major economic and military threat to the West.

But to understand more fully what it is the Russians are up to here, it is necessary first to review their other significant seagoing activities.

In the last decade, huge fleets of the Soviet Union's fishing trawlers have broken away from the home coasts and made themselves at home off Cape Cod, Newfoundland, Alaska, France, and Scotland. Just last month the

¹ General Hittle, now director for National Security and Foreign Affairs of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Washington, served during his distinguished Marine Corps career on U.S. battleships, with troops on Iwo Jima. He is an experienced analyst of global military developments.

Coast Guard had to chase Soviet trawlers out of U.S. territorial waters near Provincetown, Mass. And they so cluttered up the narrow French waters with their nets that the French fishing fleet went home in disgust. The trawlers do engage in fishing but they also have another big mission. Their masts are cluttered with high-grade electronics gear which allows them to double as communications ships and military intelligence centers. Russia's interest in the sea has grown so rapidly that in the past 25 years she has risen from 22d place in world trade to 6th. In the last 4 years alone she has increased her merchant fleet's capacity from 2.7 to 3.4 million gross tons. And to break the ice which used to keep her ships landlocked during the long Russian winter, she has constructed a modern fleet of icebreakers—at least one of them nuclear-powered—that insures year-round sailing.

On top of all this, the Soviets have concentrated on their navy. At the end of World War II, Russia did not even rank among the great nations in naval power. Now she is second, having passed even Great Britain. The backbone of the young and therefore up-to-date force is a fleet of nearly 500 submarines. Considering the fact that Nazi Germany chopped up allied convoys and almost cleared the seas with a startling force of only 57 U-boats, the Soviet figure is all the more formidable.

But there is more to the Soviet Navy than its subs. Though Premier Khrushchev has sneered that surface vessels are obsolete, he still maintains a fleet of modern cruisers and destroyers and goes on building more. And he is outfitting many of these with guided missiles to increase their firepower.

So much for the evidence. What will Russia do with all this seapower? What are her intentions?

Two major patterns emerge. One is simple and easy to see because Khrushchev has stated it loud and clear. Speaking to an American visitor in 1957, he said, "We declare war on you—excuse me for using such an expression—in the peaceful field of trade." That is what all the merchant ships are for, to carry Soviet goods, machinery, building materials—and ideas—to all corners of the world where only ships could do the job so economically. To Africa, to South America, to Japan, to Western Europe, to places where the United States herself is so dependent on trade for her own welfare. The Soviet Union is of necessity becoming a great seapower because Soviet landpower, which stretches from the Baltic to the Pacific, has almost reached its geographic limits. Any moves the Russians now wish to make to extend their influence to other continents must depend on seapower.

Ominous as it is, this pattern is ostensibly peaceful, and it is a logical development of Soviet growth which can be matched by strong economic competition. But it is the second pattern which is the most worrisome, simply because it is still rather ghostly, full of mystery and incompleteness, and rife with the possibility of military, rather than economic, conflict. This is the narrow-water pattern which is illustrated with the map on page 83 [not printed in Record].

The Soviets are using the sea in the same way they use every other form of activity—as a chessboard on which they can try to checkmate or outmaneuver the opposition as they themselves move forward. And, like good chess players, they are preparing each move with patience and foresight, willing to lose now for later gain.

The "narrow water" thesis is based on an analysis of Soviet moves so far. It goes like this: The seas are vast, but for reasons of economy, geography, and navigational convenience, seagoing trade has settled down over the centuries along certain routes. The Nazis knew this well and plied along under these routes with their U-boats. At six key

geographic spots around the world these routes come together. To avoid long time-consuming and fuel-consuming passages around huge land masses like Africa or South America, commerce is funneled through channels of water so narrow that sometimes not even two ships can pass. These six points of narrow water are the Suez Canal, the Panama Canal, the Strait of Gibraltar, the Straits of Malacca, the Skagerrak leading out of the Baltic, and the Dardanelles leading out of the Black Sea.

The last two points are not in the same category with the others as highways of world commerce. Both the Baltic and the Black Sea are virtually Soviet lakes and the possibility here is that it is Russian fleets that could be bottled up to prevent them from emerging into the Atlantic or the Mediterranean. But in each of the other four potential bottlenecks, the Russians are carrying out a series of moves which are so consistent in style and content that it is difficult to believe that they are mere coincidence.

Take the Suez. Egypt's Nasser now controls the canal. Nasser has accepted not only tremendous amounts of aid from the Russians to help him build his big Aswan Dam and handle his Soviet Mig's and other military purchases, but he has also accepted a Soviet gift of several Russian submarines. To help him run them, the Russians, of course, send in Soviet sub experts and spare parts. This gives the Russians—for the time being, at least—effective control over the subs. They thus have a cadre on hand for an underwater buildup of their own which could be used in the future to seal off the canal or make its use impractical for anyone but the Soviet Union and its friends.

Just in case this is not enough to effectively cut off traffic from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean and then on to the Pacific, the Russians are wedging in at the narrows on the southern end of the Red Sea, to the south of the Suez, where they spent 3 years building a new port at Hodeida on the coast of Yemen. From the way things have been developing in Yemen, this seems to have been a neat package deal. Yemen got a fine port right on the narrow waterway, tons of new military equipment which was landed there even before the port was completed—and a revolution last September that overthrew the monarchy and seriously threatened the status quo in the neighboring oil-rich land of Saudi Arabia.

The Russians have also been busy at the other end of the Mediterranean, where Britain's Rock of Gibraltar has guarded the western gate to that huge inland sea for centuries. Here, so long as Gibraltar stands on one side of the bottleneck, the Soviets cannot at present plug up or cork the passage. But by establishing a commanding military position on the other side of the narrow corridor, they could at least imperil its free use in the future. And this is exactly what they are doing. As the United States moves its own bases out of Morocco under Moroccan pressure, the Soviets have already delivered Mig's, light arms, military vehicles, thousands of tons of ammunition—and are negotiating to build a new shipyard for Tangiers along with a sub base at Alhucemas Bay just 100 miles southeast of Gibraltar and 150 miles from the big U.S. naval base at Rota, Spain. The Algerian revolution is already clearing the French from the southern shores of the Mediterranean.

Since Soviet naval intrusion into the Mediterranean would dangerously expose the southern flank of NATO strength in Europe, the whole scheme is so logical that the Russians are either doing all this according to a deliberate plan or they have accidentally stumbled across a most astute strategic gambit. We should know by now, however, that the Soviets seldom do anything by accident. Some military observers have been heard to

scoff at this thesis on the grounds that naval power moves of this kind are so conventional and old-fashioned in this nuclear age that the Russians could not possibly be considering them. "Let them try to seal off the 'Med,'" the answer goes, "and we'll either blast them out of the water or turn our missiles loose on Moscow." The answer—and the recent Cuban adventure bears it out—is that the Russians are sticking to their standard doctrine of making zigzag moves to advance wherever possible, withdraw when they are challenged and always avoid a major military collision.

The grab for the narrow waters fits in with this doctrine because it does not involve a single overt move of war, but consists simply of keeping on the move and exploiting all political and strategic opportunities that come along.

Cuba, of course, is another example of the same pattern being applied. Here, whether they have missiles and bombers on hand or not, the Russians are using the same combination of economic penetration, new shipyards, fishing fleets and naval presence (there was a buildup of Soviet subs in the Caribbean during the blockade) to get themselves positioned strategically near another valuable piece of narrow water, the Panama Canal. A naval base in Cuba could also help guard their routes to other Latin American countries as well and bring to an end the historic U.S. domination of the Caribbean. The important point of this thesis is not that the Russians will necessarily try to wage a hot war over any of these pressure points, but that by planting themselves on these narrow corridors they gain a tremendous advantage they never had before.

One of the most important campaigns of all in this shadowy pattern is aimed at controlling the Straits of Malacca, the long, narrow passage between the Pacific and the Indian oceans and one of the great waterways of the world.

Communist armies and guerrillas are hard at work trying to capture southeast Asia in order to grab off the rich rice bowl and encircle India from the east. There is also another target—Singapore, one of the best-positioned naval bases in the world. There is already a power vacuum in this area between Singapore and Suez because of the virtual disappearance since World War II of British seapower in the Indian Ocean. This absence of naval force helps explain the flow of Communist power into southeast Asia, and whichever nation fills this vacuum could easily dominate the entire area. The Russians are already at work in Indonesia, that vast archipelago which stretches from the Indian Ocean, past Singapore to the waters of northern Australia. Indonesia's boss, Sukarno, is a power-hungry man who likes to play with ships, so the Kremlin has given him four Soviet destroyers, eight large and modern patrol ships, a cruiser and two of its long-range "W"-class submarines. Whether Sukarno ever uses this navy in battle or not, all of his threatened neighbors know the ships are there, and they also know who controls them. The Russians have thus set up a strong naval position in the area by proxy—with Indonesian crews and flags on the ships. In a cold war like this, the psychological advantage of a bold move such as this is enough to embolden our enemies and discourage our friends. The sea is, as always, an integral part of our defenses against the spread of communism, and it is still a likely battlefield, whether cold or hot.

At a NATO meeting in Paris last month, Vice Adm. Richard M. Smeeton, of the Royal British Navy, who is NATO deputy supreme allied commander, Atlantic, warned the delegates what the Russians were up to. The Soviet navy was "more modern than NATO's," he said, and it would not be easy against this new threat to maintain free access to

the vital water routes on which the free world depended. He emphasized four routes, all narrow—the Strait of Gibraltar, the Suez Canal, the Straits of Malacca and the Panama Canal. "If we do not control the oceans," he said, summing up, "the Communists will."

DEPUTY THELMA KING—CASTRO'S NO. 1 REPRESENTATIVE IN PANAMA

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my statements on Panama Canal and Caribbean questions, I have spoken, in and out of the Congress, concerning the activities and ideology of Castro's No. 1 representative in Panama, Senora Thelma King. A member of the Panamanian National Assembly, Deputy King has been a leading agitator for a new canal treaty and, on November 16, 1961, was a cosigner with Aquilino Boyd, another extremist, of a resolution by the National Assembly stating the minimum aspirations of the Panamanian people concerning the Panama Canal enterprise. Its objectives include the sovereign control of the Canal Zone; participation in the maintenance and operation of the waterway, business activities, policing and administration of justice; raising the Panama flag on all vessels in transit as well as on public buildings in the zone; and increased benefits from toll revenues. All these demands were made without any idea of a compensatory accommodation on the part of Panama.

The claims of Panamanian sovereignty over the Panama Canal made by Deputy King, an avowed Communist or fellow traveler, is nothing new but has a history that goes back to 1904. Later, in 1917, John Reed, a notorious Communist, advocated the internationalization of the canal. In each case, the true purpose has been to wrest control of the waterway from the United States.

The fact that Deputy King is accepted without reservation in the Panama National Assembly is significant. She is thus maintained in a position from which to help in the formulation of Panamanian policies with respect to the canal. In fact and effect, she and other isthmian radicals lead the Panamanian efforts on the question of sovereignty. Certainly, it is the duty of our Government to recognize this situation and cease to temporize with it. How can our country operate the canal with any less authority than that which was written into the treaty under which it was constructed and has been since maintained and operated?

While crossing the isthmus recently on return from South America, I had an opportunity to visit the canal to inspect parts of it, and to talk with many of our citizens there, civilian and military. They are well aware of what has been, and still is, taking place on the isthmus

in the way of undermining the position of our Nation in the Canal Zone.

It was, therefore, with the keenest interest that I read in the column, "Interesting if True," by Edward Scott, in the December 13, 1962, issue of the Panama American, the record of an interview by Deputy King for the NBC System of New York.

From this it will be seen that not only has she visited Moscow but also Soviet Cuba, to which she travels frequently and always sees Castro.

Mr. Speaker, it is notorious on the isthmus that Deputy King has been brazenly violating official privileges in connection with her frequent visits to Cuba. I would urge the appropriate customs officials and other inspection authorities to make careful examinations of her baggage whenever she leaves for Havana and to look for certain types of things that are now openly and shamelessly passed through Panama.

The indicated NBC interview with Deputy King follows:

INTERESTING IF TRUE (By Edward Scott)

Wilson Hall, chief correspondent in Latin America for NBC of New York, had an interview with Thelma King, Deputy to the Panamanian National Assembly, and one of the Republic's most controversial revolutionary figures, when he was here 2 weeks ago.

The interview was taped on Walter Diamond's small recorder. NBC was not satisfied with the quality for network use, and asked me to do the interview again with Senora King—which assignment I dutifully performed in the studios of HOG, courtesy of Manager Ramon Levy.

It was used on NBC's "Monitor" program last Sunday night, and the following is a transcript of the encounter between Deputy Thelma King and Edward Unready, Isthmian correspondent of NBC:

Question. "Senora King, would you mind giving me your estimate of the Cuban situation, now that the rockets brought in by the U.S.S.R. apparently have been removed?"

Answer. "I think the situation is better because now there will be peace for Cuba and for all the hemisphere."

Question. "How do you think that Dr. Castro emerged from the situation. Do you think that he enjoys more worldwide support or support among his people, or do you think that support for him has diminished?"

Answer. "Definitely more support because Castro has proved to the world that he does not receive orders from Russia or from the United States."

Question. "You are very friendly with Mr. Castro, are you not?"

Answer. "Yes, very much."

Question. "And I understand that you admire him as a leader."

Answer. "I do admire him."

Question. "In an interview today, you were reported to have said that a revolution—that revolutionary activity—is as inevitable as the rain. Did you say something of that character?"

Answer. "Oh, yes I did, because I think that a revolution in Panama is necessary."

Question. "What kind of revolution do you speak of—a revolution of the Castro type?"

Answer. "A Panamanian revolution, but a very violent one."

Question. "Will that affect the Panama Canal?"

Answer. "I don't know. If the Americans interfere, maybe, but I suppose that the Americans are going to leave the Panamanians to deal with their own revolution."

Question. "And do you think this revolution might be accompanied by firing squads, as they had in Cuba?"

Answer. "I don't know, but in a revolution firing squads are always necessary."

Question. "You mean to execute people, to shoot them?"

Answer. "Well, in every revolution that becomes very necessary."

Question. "And so you think it might be necessary in the Panamanian revolution?"

Answer. "Definitely."

Question. "And what is your view of the present political status of the Canal Zone?"

"Do you still maintain as you have stated on previous occasions that Panama is the sovereign of the U.S. jurisdiction of the Canal Zone or what is known as the U.S. jurisdiction of the Canal Zone?"

Answer. "Panama is sovereign of the Canal Zone, she is, she was, and she will always be. Force has denied Panama all of the rights in the Canal Zone but we will get it one day."

Question. "And what form do you think it will take. How do you think you will be able to secure effective sovereignty over the Canal Zone?"

Answer. "It depends * * *. Peacefully if the Americans do not want to do it in a violent form but in any way we will get it because that is the right of the Panamanians and the new generations are not going to stand for what our forefathers did in 1903 because that belongs to the past and we want to build a very new country."

Question. "Do you think that the alternative is violence?"

Answer. "Oh, yes."

Question. "And what form of violence would you suggest might occur?"

Answer. "I don't know how it is going to happen because I cannot decide for all the Panamanians, but I know that the Panamanians are completely aware that we have to get sovereignty in the Canal Zone and we will get it one way or the other."

Question. "What is your view of the present situation in the Canal Zone where an American, named Gerald A. Doyle, is taking action against the Canal Zone authorities, the Governor and against the Secretary of the Army in order to have the Panamanian flags taken down?"

Answer. "It is very stupid to have two flags in the Canal Zone. I think only one flag has the right to be there and that is the Panamanian flag. But if I were an American, I would think exactly as Doyle is thinking now."

Question. "That is you would assume the same position that Doyle has taken and would take action against the superior authorities to have them take down the Panamanian flag?"

Answer. "If I were an American, yes."

Question. "And do you think there will be resentment in Panama if the Court decides that Doyle is right and that the flags have to come down?"

Answer. "Yes, there will be resentment because we know that we are right, but I think the Panamanians should see the side of Mr. Doyle, who, I think, is a very stubborn man, but I do feel that he is honest in his views."

Question. "I understand that you talked to Mr. Doyle the other day."

Answer. "Yes, I did."

Question. "And did you tell him what you have just said?"

Answer. "Yes, I did."

Question. "What do you think is the position of Castro revolutionary activity in the other Latin American countries including Panama since the blockade in Cuba and the cancellation of the blockade by the United States?"

Answer. "I think Castro has more support now because the Latin Americans feel that Castro has proved to the world that he is the

only leader in Latin America and the way that Castro has managed the situation has revealed without any doubt that he is a complete leader for Latin American countries. I think that Castro has more support now than he ever had before."

Question. "In Cuba and throughout Latin America?"

Answer. "Every place in Latin America."

Question. "What do you think will be the result of what occurred in Cuba insofar as the independent Russian Communist activity, which rather left Castro out in the cold. Has that not had some effect on his standing in Cuba?"

Answer. "The Latin Americans do not care about Russia nor Mr. Khrushchev. We care about Castro, we believe in Castro and believe in the Cuban revolution. That is a Latin American revolution, which has nothing to do with the United States nor with Russia. What we want is a Latin American hemisphere without the interference of the United States or Russia. We don't want Khrushchev and we don't want Kennedy."

Question. "You've been to Cuba several times this year, have you not? How many times, do you recall?"

Answer. "Four or five times."

Question. "And you are going again are you not, very soon?"

Answer. "Yes, very soon."

Question. "When do you think you might go to Cuba?"

Answer. "Next week."

Question. "And how long will you stay there?"

Answer. "Maybe 2 weeks."

Question. "And do you always see Castro when you are there?"

Answer. "Yes, I think I'll see Castro."

Question. "But you have in the past seen him quite frequently, have you not?"

Answer. "Yes."

Question. "Are you in any way connected with his movement? Are you a representative of his movement?"

Answer. "No I am not."

Question. "Could you indicate to me what you talk about with Castro. Do you talk about political topics?"

Answer. "Oh, yes."

Question. "About the future of America?"

Answer. "Yes."

Question. "And the future of Panama?"

Answer. "Yes."

Question. "And of the Panama Canal?"

Answer. "No."

Question. "Do you talk about the Guantanamo Naval Base?"

Answer. "Yes."

Question. "And is Dr. Castro of the same point of view as you are with respect to the Panama's sovereignty over the Panama Canal?"

Answer. "Well, he has said it many times so it is not something new. He has always said that Panama has the right in the Canal Zone."

Question. "And after you come back from Cuba, I understand that you are going to Europe?"

Answer. "Yes, I am going to London * * * I am going to London University to take a special course in international law."

Question. "And you are not going to Russia on this trip?"

Answer. "No I am not."

Question. "But you went to Russia on a previous trip, did you not?"

Answer. "Yes, I was in Russia."

Question. "How did you like it?"

Answer. "It is a very nice country, but I prefer Panama 100 times."

"Thank you very much indeed, Sra. King."

CONSUMER BULLETIN NO. 1

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, as circumstances permit, I expect to direct the attention of the House to business practices which affect the consumer. With the prospect of expanded consumer purchasing power resulting from reduced Federal taxes, every lure in the commercial world will be employed to pick up the extra cash.

About a week ago, my attention was drawn to the following department store advertisement:

Men's shirt sale, famous name brands. We cannot tell you the name—all sizes and colors—\$3.95 each or three for \$10.

Mr. Speaker, the store was Washington's Woodward & Lothrop, and being in need of extra shirts, I availed myself of the opportunity of the sale.

There were famous name shirts on the rack—several of them. The famous name was Arrow, and they were displayed in several different colors and sizes. The colored Arrow shirts on display were very attractive in schoolbus yellow and un-American pink. There were also displayed several varieties of striped shirts—football referee stripes not likely to be worn by young executives still hoping to succeed in business.

The several Arrow white shirts on display were in sizes designed for neckless men with flippers instead of arms. All in all, it was quite a sale.

However, there were some bright spots at the sale. The sale counters were generously supplied with attractive white shirts in all sizes and type with the following label:

Atkinson, single needle throughout, tailored in Japan, all combed cotton.

As well as another type of shirt bearing this label:

Woodward & Lothrop, Pima, tailored in Japan, 2 by 2 imported Pima.

It was then that I discovered that the famous label was a lure and that the sale was "puffed" in order to get me into an Atkinson—tailored in Japan—shirt or a Woodward & Lothrop—tailored in Japan—Pima.

Well, I have always supported reciprocal trade and the idea that free world unity depended considerably on the exchange of goods between nations, so I bought an Atkinson shirt—tailored in Japan—and decided to give it a test. In order to be thoroughly fair, I bought an Arrow shirt with a "flipper" sleeve—which I thought I could use later as a short-sleeved shirt—and sent them both to the laundry for a wash and starch test.

When the shirts returned from identical treatment at the laundry, the Arrow was of usual high quality, soft and comfortable. The Atkinson—tailored in Japan—came back like thin armorplate. The shirt was completely unresponsive to my commands. When I sat down, the Atkinson shirt remained standing. If I stood too long, the shirt tugged at me to sit down. The unruly shirt simply

refused to obey. Now, which should be the master, the shirt or the man?

Now I have no objection to sales—they can be great fun. The Woodward & Lothrop store here in Washington is a good department store—perhaps better than most. I presume the same method of merchandising prevails in all department stores. Nor do I wish to infer that all shirts or other items made in Japan are inferior. On the contrary, there are many manufactured items which are made better abroad. However, the American consumer is entitled to his money's worth whatever the product and wherever it is made.

I protest the sale technique which uses a false lure like a famous label to trap the unsuspecting customer into buying a worthless, disobedient shirt.

A LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL TO ENABLE AMERICANS TO GET THE CLEANSING BENEFITS OF DETERGENTS WITHOUT POLLUTING OUR WATER SUPPLY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 2105, designed to bar from interstate commerce, after June 30, 1965, all surface-active detergents which do not meet standards of decomposability to be set by the Surgeon General of the United States.

Surface-active detergents are at the heart of a great American industry. Even more important, detergents are used by the vast majority of American housewives in doing their weekly wash. It thus behooves one who would forbid interstate commerce in such detergents to give his reasons and, at the same time, give assurance that such prohibition will constitute neither a deathblow aimed at a thriving sector of American commerce, nor an inconvenience for the American housewife.

FOAM IN THE DRINKING WATER

The reasons for legislation are becoming painfully plain to many Americans in many parts of the country. They were burdensomely plain last year in Lindenhurst, Long Island, where housewives kept drinking water in separate containers and imported that drinking water from other communities. The reason for this extraordinary procedure was this: When a Lindenhurst housewife turned on the tap in the kitchen sink, water gushed out foaming with crisp, white suds. The thickness was such that before a container was half full of water, the suds already would have foamed out over the edge.

Similar conditions exist elsewhere in this country, including heavily developed residential areas in nearby Maryland and Virginia. The cause for this startling occurrence is the same: Used laundry or dish water, saturated with surface-active detergents, has seeped

through the ground and contaminated the sources of drinking water. We are confused, Mr. Speaker, with that classic terror of the human community, the well poisoner. Only, in this case, it is we ourselves who have poisoned our wells, we ourselves who suffer from it and, happily, we ourselves who have within our grasp the power to clean up the condition.

Pollution by detergents is not confined to underground water. As more and more detergents pass through sewage disposal plants, the rivers, streams, seas, and lakes into which the treated wastes are poured become more and more detergent polluted.

THE STUDENT PRINCE AND HAMLET

Recently I studied the detergent problem in areas which are even worse off than the worst in this country, the densely populated parts of Germany and Denmark. At Heidelberg, for example, I witnessed clouds of detergent foam floating down the River Neckar not far from where the Student Prince once sang to his love. Today it is possible he would not be able to sing, "Overhead the moon is beaming." He would not be able to see the moon because of the piling up of detergent foam on the Neckar.

At Elsinore, where Prince Hamlet confronted the ghost of his murdered father, on the rampart overlooking the sea, I saw what seemed to be either the ghost's ectoplasm or a gigantic iceberg come down from the north. By all the logic of oceanography, there could not be an iceberg there, and, sure enough, there was not. The iceberg was a mountain of detergent foam, floating serenely along on the water.

Such are a few of the more curious effects of the permanent stock of detergent foam we are accumulating in the world. The more serious ones are illustrated by the plight of the housewives at Lindenhurst. To have to carry in water from a distant source is surely a throwback to an earlier, more primitive way of life than most Americans are accustomed to. Yet such a retrogression is the direct result of our efforts to advance further in comfort, convenience and general efficiency in cleanliness. In perfecting synthetic detergents, we have become so efficient that we are hopelessly inefficient in other, equally essential, aspects of living. For the housewife whose faucet foams with her own waste wash-water, cleanliness is next to ungodliness.

HOW DETERGENTS DEVELOPED

The problem of the foam in the faucet, of course, is part of the general problem of our vastly increased population, part of the general problem of clean water procurement in changing circumstances. But there is a special aspect, also. For centuries mankind cleaned himself, his clothes and his other possessions with soap made of animal fats. Part of our American tradition of the self-sufficient frontier household—along with candle-making and home-tailoring—contains the image of huge vats in the barnyard in which soap is being boiled. Soap was and remains a largely satisfactory substance for its age-old task. It had certain disadvantages,

however, and the chief of these was its less than satisfactory union with hard water. Encountering hard water, which exists throughout the Middle West and elsewhere, natural soap, made of animal or vegetable fat, often left a ring of dirt around the bathtub or sink when the water flowed down the drain. As those of us who enjoyed a midwestern boyhood well remember, this required extra scrubbing to get rid of.

THE WORLD WAR I BLOCKADE

For Imperial Germany during World War I, the problem with natural soap was that animal and vegetable fats simply were not available in sufficient quantity, due to the blockade the Allies set up and maintained. Ingenious German chemists turned their attention to the problem and solved it. They invented synthetic detergents. These had the immediate advantage of being able to be made from obtainable materials—petroleum from the Middle East.

Later it was discovered that, due to their chemical composition, synthetic detergents, or "syndets," had other distinct advantages over natural soap. The chief of these was an unheard of ability to make things soluble that ordinarily are not. Synthetic detergents were thus ideally suited to cope with the hard water of the Midwest and other areas of the United States.

It was not, however, until the years after World War II, with the sudden availability of automatic washers for the home and for small do-it-yourself laundry businesses, that synthetic detergents really took over in the cleanser industry. The new cleansers rapidly demonstrated their superiority to the American housewife and now constitute around 80 to 85 percent of the total output. Natural soap accounts for 15 to 20 percent. It is worth pointing out that this phenomenal acceptance of a new product was not the result of promotion or salesmanship, since the producers of synthetic detergents are the same as the producers of natural soaps. It was clearly a case of a forward-looking American industry seeking and finding a better product for its customers.

The key ingredient in the new, synthetic detergents is alkyl benzene sulfonate, commonly known in the trade as ABS. This chemical substance is in plentiful supply and is cheap. It is the byproduct of petroleum refining. It works well in hard water. It is neither gummy nor sticky and can be manufactured in the form of flakes, powders, bars, or liquids. It can be combined with a variety of other cleansing builders in order to accomplish many specific cleansing jobs. ABS is not abnormally irritating to sensitive skins. With all these advantages, ABS quickly became the base upon which the American soap industry transformed itself into the synthetic detergent industry.

THE SCARCITY OF PURE WATER

At the same time that ABS was being eagerly accepted by the American housewife everywhere, Americans generally were becoming aware of a serious problem. Our water supplies were in danger. Once mankind progressed beyond the most primitive of communities, the con-

stant, adequate supply of pure water became a problem.

It has been one ever since. Some of the most noble architectural achievements of the ancient world, the Roman aqueducts, testify to the great age of the problem and of man's attempts to solve it. The aqueduct suggests a rather simple solution: bring in fresh water from its source in mountain streams, use it as needed, and throw the waste into the river to be carried to the sea.

The water problem is no longer quite that simple. Instead, we live in the middle of, and by the grace of, a water cycle. In its progress from mountain spring or melting glacier or falling rain, to the open sea, our water is used and reused many times by succeeding communities along our rivers. This is possible because of nature's own process of purification, a process imitated and increased by man's water purification plants.

The problem of water today is that we are polluting water faster than we can purify it. The problem presented by synthetic detergents is that, unlike animal or vegetable fat soaps, these new, artificial substances do not lend themselves to nature's plans for the purification and reuse of water. The very qualities which make ABS so outstanding a cleanser also make it a special problem in the water cycle. Once water has been saturated with synthetic detergents, it stays that way. Nature is powerless to purify such water because ABS, brought out of petroleum, is an artificial insert into the water cycle.

So synthetic detergents, like Tennyson's brook, go on forever. We must now ask ourselves, What is the harm in that? Water contains chemicals already—hydrogen and oxygen, if I remember correctly—so what harm are a few more going to do?

The answer is: Plenty.

1. ESTHETIC: THE RIGHT TO FOAM-FREE WATER

Pure water needs to be more than just free from poison: it must be appetizing to look at. Since the creation, pure water has been a source of beauty to man. It is not beautiful to see huge clouds of detergent foam floating on rivers and lakes. It is downright alarming to have foam pour out of the faucet.

Apologists for the detergent industry have from time to time attempted to make a virtue out of the vice of detergents' penchant for perpetual foam:

If your tap water foams, be grateful for the detergents. The foaming indicates that your water supply is polluted, and while the detergents won't kill you, the other pollutants may.

To this pitch, the American public can quite justifiably say, Thanks for nothing. The analogy to the canary whose early death warned the coal miner of impending air poisoning seems misplaced, since coal miners were not in the habit of eating the canaries.

2. DIRECT POISONING OF HUMAN BEINGS

There is no evidence, so far, that detergents as presently contained in our water supplies are directly harmful when consumed by human beings. But these tentative conclusions are based on only 2 years of study, a wholly inadequate time in view of the cumulative nature

of the synthetic detergent problem. Syndets do not dissolve in water and they are not subject to normal bacterial action. Detergents are now being added to our water supplies at an annual rate of increase of 5 percent. At this rate, the present, apparently nontoxic level of detergents in our water supplies will be doubled in 14 years. It would be folly to ignore future dangers.

Furthermore, the more recent literature on the effects of detergents indicates that drinking detergent-containing water may be directly dangerous. A publication of the official West German Institute for Water, Soil, and Air Hygiene of June 1962 prepared by Dr. W. Janicke, finds indications of cancer-producing effects of detergents in the water supply.

3. INTERFERENCE WITH SEWAGE DISPOSAL

Detergents increasingly interfere with the process of sewage disposal. They do so in a number of ways. Workers in sewage disposal plants, it is reported, have difficulty performing their tasks because they cannot see what they are doing for the detergent foam.

Dr. Erich Naumann, head of the West German Institute for Water, Soil, and Air Hygiene—Berlin-Dahlem—told me, when I conferred with him in November, that detergent foam retards the process of sewage treatment in disposal plants by preventing light and oxygen from getting into the brew which the sewage-disposal plant is trying to decompose. Even without the foam, the dissolved detergents in the brew may prevent the adequate diffusion of oxygen already in the water.

A retarding effect of the decomposition process, similar to that which takes place in sewage-disposal plants, takes place also in septic tanks and similar underground method of waste disposal.

4. TRANSPORTATION

On European rivers and canals, instances have been recorded of detergent suds blowing against the pilothouse and obstructing the view of the master of the vessel. Auto accidents have also been caused by suds blowing from a river or canal onto the windshield of a motorist on an adjoining highway.

With the potential increase of detergents in our waters, this danger will correspondingly increase.

5. DANGER TO FISH

The state of learning on the effect of detergents on fish is contained in a study prepared for me by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service. I quote from that study—"Detergents—A Source of Pollution and What Is Being Done," by Edward Wise, Senior Specialist in Science and Technology, Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, November 1, 1962:

There is a scarcity of information available on ABS concentrations in natural waters of fisheries or recreational importance. There is, likewise, a paucity of information on toxicity of syndets and surfactants to fish and aquatic life. In some European countries, the possible effects of detergents on fish have received more attention than in this country. The majority conclusion is that ABS, in normally found concentrations, does not appear to be toxic to fish. There is evidence to the contrary, however.

A recent report of the (British) Department of Scientific and Industrial Research states: "It was concluded that under the conditions likely to be experienced in rivers in this country, detergent residues present no serious danger to fish." The technical advisory council of the Soap and Detergent Association, after reviewing all the research in this area, stated early this year, "so far as we can determine, there are no cases on record of fish kills in streams or lakes directly attributable to ABS."

In 1959 Henderson and others conducted toxicity experiments on fathead minnows using syndets (Cheer, Tide, Dreft, Felsol, and Vel) and ordinary soap (Lux Flakes, Ivory Snow, and Fels Naphtha). They used bioassay methods involving various median tolerance limits—concentration of test material causing 50 percent mortality (TL_{50}). Their findings are of interest. The household syndets were all toxic to fish at moderate levels. Four of the five syndets were more toxic in hard water than soft water. (Average 96 hr. TL_{50} —39 parts per million for hard water against 61 parts per million for soft water.) Soaps were slightly more toxic (average 96 hr. TL_{50} —34 parts per million in soft water). In hard water, however, the average TL_{50} of 1,470 parts per million indicated soaps to be about 40 times less toxic in hard water than soft water and from 20 to 40 times less toxic than syndets. Thus, while the toxicity of household syndets is roughly comparable to soaps in soft waters, soaps are much less toxic in hard waters.

Bioassays were then conducted separately on varying concentrations of the major surfactant, ABS. The 96 hr. TL_{50} values averaged 6.6 parts per million (ranging from 3.6 to 9.2 parts per million) in soft water and averaged 4.3 parts per million (3.5 to 5.1 parts per million) in hard water; thus indicating that these materials were considerably more toxic than packaged syndets.

From all this work, it was concluded that a concentration of ABS exceeding 1 or 2 parts per million may be expected to have some effect on the more sensitive fishes. Others have reported toxicity results on concentrations of syndets ranging from 2 to 25 parts per million. Obviously, more research information, both laboratory and field, is needed before precisely safe concentrations can be estimated.

Mr. Speaker, there are indications that the first effects of increasing detergents in our rivers, lakes, and streams will be evacuation by fish of these waters, rather than their wholesale destruction. Fish swim away from large bodies of petroleum substances which flow in their water. When the entire stretch of their water world becomes contaminated, they will attempt to swim to a whole new area.

THE SUFFOLK COUNTY PROPOSAL

Confronted with the detergent problem, American communities have moved slowly and cautiously. Only one governmental unit has elaborated and put into force an effective code for dealing with syndets in the water supply. Suffolk County, N.Y., the eastern half of Long Island, attacked the end result of the long process by requiring commercial laundries to filter out waste detergents before discharging their sewage. This is an expensive process.

It seems inevitable that, as the accumulation of ABS builds predictably up, more and more communities will be forced to adopt the rather cumbersome and certainly costly methods of Suffolk County. However, there is another approach to the problem. Since it is a

nationwide problem, a nationwide solution is justified. The problem can be attacked at its source, namely the production of synthetic detergents.

Legislation requesting the return to soap as this Nation's primary cleanser is not justified. The change-back would be enormously costly to the companies concerned and it would be justly resented by the American housewife, who has learned to appreciate the many virtues of the synthetics. It is possible, however, to produce synthetic detergents so constituted that they will yield to the normal breakdown of waste products by either nature's bacterial process or man's imitation of nature's process in our sewage treatment plants.

SUCCESSFUL RESEARCH

Successful research along these lines has been and is being conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by some States, and by universities, the latter two with the aid of grants from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Public Health Service. Similar research is also being conducted by the detergent industry, although industry spokesmen have sometimes shown an unfortunate tendency to treat the problem as essentially one of public relations—or public education—rather than as the important part of the water pollution problem it certainly is.

At this point the problem is one of production and costs, not one of discovering the technical solution. That discovery has been made. Fittingly enough, it was made in Germany, the original source of both the benefits and dangers of synthetic detergents. The new types of detergents have been successfully developed in plants at Huels, at Gelsenkirchen, and at Hamburg. These new synthetics clean as well as those now in use. But they decompose in much the manner of soap made from natural animal and vegetable fats, and they do so without foaming. They are only slightly more expensive than the nondecomposing synthetics now threatening the purity of our water. The problem is not a laboratory problem, but an industrial management problem.

H.R. 2105 is essentially aimed at helping management make the transition to decomposable detergents. The commercial risks of such a change are evident. The manufacturer who undertakes it immediately raises the cost of his product, thereby putting himself at a competitive disadvantage with any manufacturer who does not make the change. Conceivably the entire American industry could place itself at a similar disadvantage in relation to imported detergents made under the old, nondecomposing formulas. Again the German experience is valuable as a guide.

The West German Government, concerned with the problem of detergent water pollution, tried prolongedly and unsuccessfully to accelerate research by private German industry. Switching to legislation, the legislature of the Federal German Republic passed the law of September 5, 1961. Under its provisions, nondecomposable synthetic detergents are banned from the German market

after December 31, 1964. An Executive order of October 1962 spells out the details of technical compliance. Briefly, the new standard of decomposability is 80 percent as compared with the former rate of 20 percent. The legislation and its ensuing Executive order are designed to protect the cooperative manufacturer against unfair competition from noncooperating manufacturers both at home and abroad.

H.R. 2105 would essentially adopt the successful approach used in West Germany. The text of H.R. 2105 follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other form of business enterprise.

(2) The term "interstate commerce" means (A) commerce between any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States and any place outside thereof which is within the United States, (B) commerce between points in the same State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or possession of the United States, but through any place outside thereof, or (C) commerce wholly within the District of Columbia or any possession of the United States.

(3) The term "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States.

(4) The term "Surgeon General" means the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

(5) The term "detergent" means any synthetic petroleum-based detergent.

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person to import into the United States or introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce any detergent after June 30, 1965, unless such detergent conforms with standards of decomposability prescribed pursuant to section 3 of this Act.

STANDARDS OF DECOMPOSABILITY

SEC. 3. (a) The Surgeon General shall on or before the one hundred and eightieth day after the date of enactment of this Act prescribe and publish in the Federal Register standards of decomposability for detergents, based on the latest scientific and technical knowledge available with respect to the manufacture of detergents and the operation of sewage treatment systems, which will assure that all detergents imported into the United States or shipped in interstate commerce after June 30, 1965, will decompose reasonably quickly and completely after use. Included with such standards shall be specific methods by which detergents shall be tested by the Surgeon General to determine if they conform to such standards.

SEIZURES

SEC. 4. (a) Any detergent which does not conform with standards prescribed pursuant to section 3 when introduced into or while in interstate commerce or while held for sale (whether or not the first sale) after shipment in interstate commerce shall be liable to be proceeded against while such detergent is in interstate commerce or at any time thereafter, on libel of information and condemned in any district court in the United States within the jurisdiction of which such detergent is found; except that this section shall not apply to a detergent intended for export to any foreign country.

(b) Such detergent shall be liable to seizure by process pursuant to the libel, and

the procedure in cases under this section shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the procedure in admiralty; except that on demand of either party any issue of fact joined in any such case shall be tried by jury. When libel for condemnation proceedings under this section, involving the same claimant and the same issues, are pending in two or more jurisdictions, such pending proceedings, upon application of the United States or the claimant seasonably made to the court of one such jurisdiction, shall be consolidated for trial by order of such court, and tried in (1) any district selected by the applicant where one of such proceedings is pending; or (2) a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties. If no order for consolidation is so made within a reasonable time, the United States or the claimant may apply to the court of one such jurisdiction, and such court (after giving the other party, the claimant, or the United States attorney for such district, reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard) shall by order, unless good cause to the contrary is shown, specify a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, in which all such pending proceedings shall be consolidated for trial and tried. Such order of consolidation shall not apply so as to require the removal of any case the date for trial of which has been fixed. The court granting such order shall give prompt notification thereof to the other courts having jurisdiction of the cases covered thereby.

(c) Any detergent condemned under this section shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may, in accordance with the provisions of this section, direct and the proceeds thereof, if sold, less the legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States; but such detergent shall not be sold under such decree contrary to the provisions of this Act or the laws of the jurisdiction in which sold; except that after entry of the decree and upon the payment of the costs of such proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that such detergent shall not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of this Act, the court may by order direct that such detergent be delivered to the owner thereof to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the provisions of this Act under the supervision of an officer or employee duly designated by the Surgeon General, and the expenses of such supervision shall be paid by the person obtaining release of the detergent under bond.

(d) When a decree of condemnation is entered against the detergent, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the detergent.

(e) In the case of removal for trial of any case as provided by subsection (b)—

(1) the clerk of the court from which removal is made shall promptly transmit to the court in which the case is to be tried all records in the case necessary in order that such court may exercise jurisdiction;

(2) the court to which such case is removed shall have the powers and be subject to the duties, for purposes of such case, which the court from which removal was made would have had, or to which such court would have been subject, if such case had not been removed.

INJUNCTIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown and subject to the provisions of rule 65(a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to restrain violations of this Act.

(b) In any proceeding for criminal contempt for violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this section, which violation also constitutes a violation

of this Act, trial shall be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury. Such trial shall be conducted in accordance with the practice and procedure applicable in the case of proceedings subject to the provisions of rule 42(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

STYLE OF ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS—SUB-PENAS

SEC. 6. All libel or injunction proceedings for the enforcement, or to restrain violations, of this Act shall be by and in the name of the United States. Subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the United States in any district may run into any other district in any such proceeding.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) The authority to promulgate regulations for the efficient enforcement of this Act, except as otherwise provided in this section, is hereby vested in the Surgeon General.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Surgeon General shall jointly prescribe regulations for the efficient enforcement of the provisions of section 9, except as otherwise provided therein. Such regulations shall be promulgated in such manner and take effect at such time, after due notice, as the Surgeon General shall determine.

EXAMINATIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS

SEC. 8. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to conduct examinations, inspections, and investigations for the purposes of this Act through officers and employees of the Public Health Service or through any health officer or employee of any State, or political subdivision thereof, duly commissioned by the Surgeon General.

(b) For purposes of enforcement of this Act, officers or employees duly designated by the Surgeon General, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized (1) to enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, or establishment in which detergents are manufactured, processed, packed, or held for introduction into interstate commerce or are held after such introduction, or to enter any vehicle being used to transport or hold such detergents in interstate commerce; (2) to inspect, at reasonable times and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, such factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle, and all pertinent equipment, finished and unfinished materials; and (3) to obtain samples of such materials. A separate notice shall be given for each such inspection, but a notice shall not be required for each entry made during the period covered by the inspection. Each such inspection shall be commended and completed with reasonable promptness.

(c) If the officer or employee obtains any sample, prior to leaving the premises, he shall give to the owner, operator, or agent in charge a receipt describing the samples obtained. If an analysis is made of such sample, a copy of the results of such analysis shall be furnished promptly to the owner, operator, or agent in charge.

IMPORTS

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver to the Surgeon General, upon his request, samples of detergents which are being imported or offered for import into the United States, giving notice thereof to the owner or consignee, who may appear before the Surgeon General and have the right to introduce testimony. If it appears from the examination of such samples or otherwise that such detergent does not conform to standards prescribed pursuant to section 3, such detergent shall be refused admission, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the destruction of any such detergent refused admission unless such

detergent is exported, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, within ninety days of the date of notice of such refusal or within such additional time as may be permitted pursuant to such regulations.

(b) Pending decision as to the admission of a detergent being imported or offered for import, the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize delivery of such detergent to the owner or consignee upon the execution by him of a good and sufficient bond providing for the payment of such liquidated damages in the event of default as may be required pursuant to regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

H.R. 2105 prohibits the movement in interstate commerce after June 30, 1965, of detergents unless they conform with the standards of decomposability to be prescribed by the Surgeon General within 180 days after the enactment of the act. The Surgeon General is instructed to set up standards to require that detergents decompose reasonably quickly and completely.

It is anticipated that the Surgeon General would set up standards somewhat along the lines of the German standards. We already know that industry can readily and quickly meet these standards.

H.R. 2105 will spur research and speed the arrival of decomposable detergents. We have had detergents for some 40 years. If we allow them to pollute our water supply for another 40 years, we cannot look upon ourselves as much of a civilization. The time allowed—until June 30, 1965, some 2½ years—is adequate. The cutoff of harmful detergents at that time will insure that reputable manufacturers do not face cutthroat competition either at home or from abroad.

No one at all aware of the water problems of the United States today would pretend that this legislation is anything more than the smallest step toward their ultimate solution. But it is a step. By adopting this course, the U.S. Government will have shown that, confronted with a specific source of specific water pollution, it can move efficiently and effectively toward the removal of the source.

The legislation, therefore, will not only create an immediate improvement, it will serve as a pledge and a precedent for further action in the future.

PRAISE FOR OUR SPEAKER

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we in the House have always been conscious of the leadership qualities of our Speaker. We have always recognized his fairness, his devotion to principle and his willingness to cooperate with Members, regardless of party.

We have also recognized the contribution that he has made to the passage of

difficult legislation which he considered to be for the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

These qualities and attributes of our Speaker have not been so widely known outside the neighborhood of the Capitol, and it is a distinct pleasure, therefore, to find a growing recognition of his position in the legislative process and in the Government, generally. As an example of this recognition, I am pleased to include herewith a recent column on Speaker McCORMACK, by William S. White, which appeared in the *Waterbury American* on January 15, 1963:

McCORMACK TAKES HIS PLACE

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congress has at last entered the post-Rayburn era, more than a year after the death of the man whose power and personality had dominated it so long—Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas.

His successor, Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, has now emerged from the long shadow of "Mr. Sam" to become the heart in fact of the House of Representatives. So, too, has emerged the assisting group immediately around him—Representative CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, the Democratic floor leader, and Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, the Democratic whip, or assistant leader.

All this must now in fairness be said by those who, like this columnist, had seen Sam Rayburn, of Texas—agree with him always or not—as more or less the indispensable man. It is not necessary to go so far as to say that McCORMACK has succeeded to all of Rayburn's prestige or rare sense of national responsibility.

He has, however, now truly and fully succeeded to Rayburn's position. Heretofore, he was a sort of probationary Speaker, serving in a Chamber where the old master's commanding voice had been so profoundly missed that the ukases of his successor tended to be lost in the nostalgia of the yesterdays.

VICTORY ON RULES

All this, though not inconsiderable, is about the only real meaning of the success of McCORMACK, ALBERT, and BOGGS—allied with the Kennedy White House—in keeping the vital House Rules Committee packed as Rayburn himself had packed it at the onset of another Congress in 1961.

The mere result itself, despite much happy gee-whizzing by leadership Democrats, was not so much a victory as a staving off of defeat. After all, the administration is no better off than it was before. But—after all, too—it is surely no worse off; and worse off it very well might have been.

The Rules Committee has a qualified—but not a total—right to prevent legislation from reaching a vote in the House, because this committee normally must give right of way to all bills. Two years ago Rayburn increased it from 12 to 15 members so as to reduce the power of its conservative coalition to bottle up Kennedy measures. The change was to last only until 1963 unless the House, by affirmative action, decided otherwise.

The question as this new Congress opened thus was whether the committee should revert to the total clutches of the Republican-southern Democratic coalition or remain the moderate instrumentality which Rayburn had made it.

PROOF OF LEADERSHIP

With a good deal of hard wheeling and dealing and maybe a little logrolling—all of which is both constitutional and permissible—McCORMACK and his associates saved the committee at its present size. Though

literally it was a standoff, in spirit it was more than this, since it was so much better than the defeat which only weeks ago seemed likely to await them.

The value of the episode to the Kennedy administration is its proof that the McCORMACK leadership—allied to other increasingly savvy Boston political pros in the White House like Kenneth O'Donnell and Larry O'Brien—has come into its own. So, too, have they.

It would be the greatest mistake, however, to suppose that all is now clear in the House for liberal legislation. The Rules Committee is still there, and unchanged. That part of the President's program which is welfarist in tone will be no better off than before.

For the sole real victory here, apart from the personal vindication of McCORMACK's leadership, is a victory not for liberalism but, again, for moderation. It is the mixture as before, the only difference being that the new pharmacist, McCORMACK, is now fully qualified in his own right.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. Nix), from January 21 through January 31, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN of New York for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. CURTIS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 1 hour, on February 14.

Mr. KORNEGAY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON), for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON), for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. ALGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. BERRY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TAYLOR) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. KASTENMEIER in two instances.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. MOSS in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

205. A letter from the President, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the 34th Annual Report of the Work and Operations of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, pursuant to 22 U.S.C., 278a (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

206. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report covering the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1962; to the Committee on Agriculture.

207. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the discharge of minors who enlist in the naval service or the Coast Guard without consent of parents or guardian"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

208. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to dispose of telephone facilities by negotiated sale"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

209. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report relating to the number of officers in the Coast Guard above the rank of lieutenant commander receiving monthly flight pay for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

210. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report relating to the number of officers in the Navy above the rank of lieutenant commander receiving monthly flight pay for the 6-month period through December 1962, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

211. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

212. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize payment of a claim made by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

213. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report by the Veterans' Administration on its activities in the disposal of foreign excess property for the period January 1 through December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

214. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report of the General Services Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; to the Committee on Government Operations.

215. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the Post Office Depart-

ment's procurement of lockboxes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

216. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the procurement of crude helium by the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, under four negotiated fixed-price contracts awarded during fiscal year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 86-777; to the Committee on Government Operations.

217. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the catalog prices charged for klystron tubes under non-competitive procurements negotiated by the military departments and their prime contractors with Varian Associates, Palo Alto, Calif.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

218. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of rental charges, costs, and other matters relating to Government-owned quarters provided to employees of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

219. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to the extension of the authority of the Secretary of the Interior exercised through the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior to areas outside the national domain, pursuant to Public Law 87-626; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

220. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

221. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the alteration, maintenance, and repair of Government buildings and property under lease or concession contracts entered into pursuant to the operation and maintenance of Government-owned airports under the jurisdiction of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

222. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Federal Aviation Agency, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

223. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1030, 1039), in order to increase the periods for which agreements for the operation of certain concessions may be granted at the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

224. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

225. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of certain final valuations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

226. A letter from the executive vice president, Agricultural Hall of Fame, transmitting the annual audit and report for their fiscal year September 1, 1961, through August 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 86-680; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

227. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

228. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 2388 of title 18, United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

229. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

230. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

231. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to authorize courts of bankruptcy to determine the dischargeability or nondischargeability of provable debts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

232. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

233. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

234. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n)"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

235. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend subsection b of section 60—Preferred Creditors; subsection e of section 67—Liens and Fraudulent Transfers; and subsection e of section 70—Title to Property; of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96b, 107e, and 110e)"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

236. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

237. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

238. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, relative to the establishment of an additional position in grade GS-18, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

239. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

240. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the 46th Annual Report of the U.S. Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 1890. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 1891. A bill to strengthen democratic processes respecting the calling of strikes, to protect employees against unjustifiable pay losses from strikes, to protect employers from needless production interruptions arising out of strikes contrary to the wishes of employees, and to minimize industrial strife interfering with the flow of commerce and the national security by amending the National Labor Relations Act to require economic strikes to be authorized by a secret ballot; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 1892. A bill to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351-355, 357-360); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 1893. A bill to provide, under the laws of the District of Columbia, for the life imprisonment of any person convicted of four felonies; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 1894. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 1895. A bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1896. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to authorize student assistance for study in such institutions, and to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of certain public community college facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 1897. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1898. A bill to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so that they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 1899. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 1900. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 1901. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 1902. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 1903. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the wholesale sale of liquors by retail dealers to certain organizations without payment of the special tax on wholesale dealers in liquors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 1904. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 1905. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the midstate reclamation project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1906. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to implement the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 1907. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 1908. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the costs of education or training shall be deductible as trade or business expenses when incurred in order to obtain a new or better job, as well as when incurred in order to maintain existing skills, status, salary, or employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 1909. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to provide that a home improvement loan may be the subject of insurance thereunder even though its maturity exceeds the specified limits if it is made for the purpose of financing the construction of a family fallout shelter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 1910. A bill to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such grants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBSTEN:

H.R. 1911. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evi-

dence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1912. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the unmarried child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a full-time student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 1913. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 1914. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1915. A bill to strengthen democratic processes respecting the calling of strikes, to protect employees against unjustifiable pay losses from strikes, to protect employers from needless production interruptions arising out of strikes contrary to the wishes of employees, and to minimize industrial strife interfering with the flow of commerce and the national security by amending the National Labor Relations Act to require economic strikes to be authorized by a secret ballot; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 1916. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the present provisions permitting the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1917. A bill to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1918. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 1919. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 1920. A bill to provide that until the national debt is retired, not less than 5 percent of the net budget receipts of the United States for each fiscal year shall be utilized solely for reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 1921. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for needy individuals who are 70 years of age or over and are not otherwise entitled to benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1922. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze with 15

quarters of coverage, regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1923. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1924. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 1925. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local youth public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 1926. A bill to encourage the development, initiation, and expansion of occupational safety programs in the States through grants to States for demonstration and experimental occupational safety projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 1927. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to revise the rates of disability and death pension authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 1928. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 1929. A bill to permit an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia to detain and question persons suspected of committing crimes; and to require bond in the case of certain material witnesses; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1930. A bill to provide for the admission of certain evidence in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1931. A bill to increase the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and of the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1932. A bill to amend section 927 of the act of March 3, 1901, relating to responsibility for criminal conduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1933. A bill to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1934. A bill to increase the jurisdiction of the municipal court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the name of the court, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1935. A bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 1936. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 1937. A bill to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 1938. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1939. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local youth public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 1940. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to facilitate the conservation of land for open space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 1941. A bill to provide for the establishment of Valle Grande National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 1942. A bill to authorize modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana, in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 1943. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1944. A bill to amend the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 to permit American citizens to hold limited quantities of gold coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 1945. A bill to extend for 1 additional year the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 1946. A bill to amend title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for a Science Information Data Processing Center to be located at one place in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 1947. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 1948. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 1949. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 1950. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRADEMANS:

H.R. 1951. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 1952. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 1953. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 1954. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 1955. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 1956. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 1957. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 1958. A bill to amend section 303(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize in the case of members of the uniformed services transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings within Alaska and between Alaska and the 48 contiguous States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1959. A bill to authorize the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of Government employees assigned to duty in Alaska; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 1960. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1961. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Senior Citizens within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help senior citizens; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1962. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make it clear that disaster loans in cases of flood or other catastrophe may be made with respect to property of any type (including summer homes as well as other residential property); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 1963. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from \$600 to \$1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1964. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that upon application therefor, real property donated to the United States by any State or political subdivision which is surplus to the United States shall be returned to such State or political subdivision; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 1965. A bill making an appropriation to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1963 to enable him to assist the States in providing day care under their State child-welfare services plans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 1966. A bill making an appropriation to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1964 to enable him to assist the States in providing child-welfare services (including day care) under their State child-welfare services plans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 1967. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1968. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for qualified dependent relatives of certain insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1969. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a full-time student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1970. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1971. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1972. A bill to eliminate the requirement that poll taxes be paid in order to qualify for voting; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 1973. A bill to amend section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as it relates to picketing; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 1974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for amounts paid for tuition or fees to institutions of higher education or for occupational training or retraining to allow a credit for taxes paid for public education, and to exempt from income tax certain scholarships, fellowships, and student assistantships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 1975. A bill to provide coverage under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, as self-employed individuals, for Federal employees in the legislative branch who are not eligible to participate in the civil service retirement program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 1976. A bill to provide financial aid to all employers engaged in commerce and industry who will maintain full employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 1977. A bill to amend the Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 1978. A bill to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to increase the amount which may be made available annually by the United States for loans to students in institutions of higher education participating in the loan program under title II; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 1979. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured

mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 1980. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 1981. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the United States Science Academy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 1982. A bill to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 1983. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1984. A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1985. A bill to provide additional means of securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1986. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work-measurement programs, or other performance-standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1987. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 1988. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1989. A bill to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 1990. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMANS:

H.R. 1991. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 1992. A bill to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1993. A bill to repeal the interest rate limitations on obligations of the United States issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 1994. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1995. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 1996. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 1997. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 1332 of title 28, United States Code, relating to diversity of citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 1998. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 1999. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 2000. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2001. A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2002. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2003. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to enable the Federal National Mortgage Association to provide special assistance in the financing of fallout shelters constructed with FHA-insured loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 2004. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2005. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2006. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase the minimum amount of the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 2007. A bill to repeal the Federal retailers excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2008. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Philip Murray; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 2009. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2010. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2011. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for the increased use of milled or enriched rice by the Armed Forces, Federal penal and correctional institutions, and to certain federally operated hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2012. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2013. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2014. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the lim-

itation upon the amount of outside income which may be received by an individual while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 2015. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to extend to imported tangerines the restrictions imposed by such section on certain other imported commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 2016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional \$2,400 exemption from income tax from amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 2017. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 2018. A bill to correct a technical error in the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 2019. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 2020. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to require authorization for certain appropriations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2021. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2022. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 2023. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to crediting certain service of females sworn in as members of telephone operating units, Signal Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2024. A bill to prohibit the use of Government property by any organization practicing segregation on the basis of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2025. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2026. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2027. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 2028. A bill to suspend for 3 years the duty on hexachlorethane; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 2029. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance, repair, or construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 2030. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities

of Panama Canal ship pilots; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2031. A bill to authorize the continuation of certain inspection activities of the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2032. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2033. A bill to provide that agricultural furloughs during World War I shall be deemed creditable service for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2034. A bill to provide for the establishment of a soil and water conservation research field station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2035. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of an individual's wages, salary, or other income shall be exempt from levy to enforce the payment of Federal taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 2036. A bill to revise the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2037. A bill to repeal part I of subchapter G of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 2038. A bill to provide for the waiver of a condition on certain land in Clatsop County, Oreg., so as to permit its use as a public park; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 2039. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the operation of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2040. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2041. A bill to make the civil service retirement and disability fund available for annuity benefits authorized by law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2042. A bill relating to rates of postage on third-class matter mailed by certain non-profit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2043. A bill to extend the benefits of the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to certain individuals; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 2044. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELL:

H.R. 2045. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2046. A bill to grant civil service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 2047. A bill to authorize survey and establishment of a townsite for the Juneau Indian Village of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2048. A bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 2048. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit a Representative in Congress to nominate as a candidate to a service academy, a person domiciled at any

place in the State from which such Representative is elected; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 2050. A bill to provide that tips and other gratuities received by an individual in the course of his employment (or self-employment) may be considered self-employment income for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2051. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2052. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 2053. A bill to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 2054. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 2055. A bill to amend section 277 of title 10, United States Code, to provide post exchange and other privileges for persons transferred to the Retired Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 2056. A bill to provide for the acquisition of four additional hospitals by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 2057. A bill to authorize a per capita distribution of \$500 from certain funds of the Yakima Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2058. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work-measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H.R. 2059. A bill to amend section 277 of title 10, United States Code, to provide commissary and other privileges for retired civil service employees and their wives or widows, and veterans on pension or compensation and their wives or widows; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 2060. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 2061. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from \$600 to \$1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2062. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2063. A bill to amend section 601 of the Federal Aviation Act to require identification markings on the underside of the wings of certain aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2064. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require the suspension or revocation of airman certificates in connection with the imposition of civil

penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2065. A bill to permit the burial in national cemeteries of mothers of deceased servicemen or veterans who died leaving no spouse or minor child entitled to be buried in a national cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2066. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to give the Administrator of such agency authority to prescribe standards relating to the suppression of noise created by the operation of aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2067. A bill to amend section 902(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so that the criminal penalties provided therein will apply to violations of civil aeronautics safety regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2068. A bill providing that the Surgeon General of the United States shall establish a hospital at Ellis Island, N.Y., for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming narcotic drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2069. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2070. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to issue certain regulations concerning air traffic at La Guardia and New York-International (Idlewild) Airports in the State of New York, and Newark Airport in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 2071. A bill to permit States or other duly constituted taxing authorities to subject persons to liability for payment of property taxes on property located in Federal areas within such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2072. A bill to assure payment of just compensation for the use and occupancy of certain lands on Kwajalein and Dalap Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2073. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 2074. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 2075. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the restriction on the period during which an application for a determination of disability is granted full retroactivity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 2076. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct (as trade or business expenses) the expenses of travel, meals, and lodging while employed away from his regular place of abode; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2077. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the care of his children while his wife is physically or mentally incapable of caring for such children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2078. A bill to amend section 170(b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2079. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain insurance agents shall be treated as outside salesmen for purposes of computing adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2080. A bill to provide social security coverage as self-employed individuals for fee office branch managers of the Michigan Department of State and their employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 2081. A bill to transfer certain administrative responsibility for the operation of Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to a Washington Airports Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2082. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2083. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for certain nonprofit clubs organized and operated for the purpose of paying benefits to the members and their dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child-care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2086. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2087. A bill to amend paragraph (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption provided for by such paragraph; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2088. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission, after investigation and hearing, to require the establishment of through routes and joint rates between motor common carriers of property, and between such carriers and common carriers by rail, express, and water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2089. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and certain supplementary and related acts with respect to the requirement of an oath for certain reports, applications, and complaints filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2090. A bill to clarify certain provisions of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act and to place transactions involving unifications or acquisitions of control of freight forwarders under the provisions of section 5 of the act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2091. A bill to amend section 222(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the service of process in enforcement proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2092. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2093. A bill to amend section 212(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2094. A bill to make the civil forfeiture provisions of section 222(h) of the Interstate Commerce Act applicable to unlawful operations and safety violations by motor carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 2095. A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 2096. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in the home; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 2097. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 2098. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow gas tax refunds due for gasoline used by aerial applicators serving farmers to be refunded to the aerial applicators providing such service to farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2099. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the refund of manufacturers excise taxes in certain cases where the articles are exported by persons other than the manufacturers, producers, or importers of the articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 2100. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special rule for the computation of net earnings from self-employment by ministers and members of religious orders under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2101. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act so as to require Federal Power Commission authority for the construction, extension, or operation of certain facilities for the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2102. A bill to provide for Federal assistance on a combination grant and loan basis in order to improve patient care in public and other nonprofit hospitals and nursing homes through the modernization or replacement of those institutions which are structurally or functionally obsolete; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2103. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 2104. A bill to authorize assumption by the various States of civil or criminal jurisdiction over cases arising on Indian reservations with the consent of the tribe involved; to permit gradual transfer of such jurisdiction to the States; and other purposes.

poses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 2105. A bill to require certain standards of decomposability of synthetic petroleum-based detergents imported into the United States or shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 2106. A bill to amend the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 526), as amended, relating to the establishment of a register of names in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle drivers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2107. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 2108. A bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 2109. A bill to amend the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 526), as amended, relating to the establishment of a register of names in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle drivers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2110. A bill to authorize grants to assist the States in strengthening professional nurse education, in order to relieve the shortage of well-trained professional nurses and to meet the requirements of Federal, State, and local governmental hospitals and health agencies, as well as of non-governmental hospitals and other employers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 2111. A bill to amend subchapter S of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a small business corporation may in certain cases retain its tax status thereunder even though one of its shareholders becomes a trust; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 2112. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2113. A bill to amend section 625 of the Public Health Service Act to require that hospitals assisted under the Hill-Burton program shall not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, or color in selection of their staff or employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2114. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2115. A bill to provide protection against lynchings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2116. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for certain dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age or disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2117. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove all limitations upon the amount of the deduction allowed a taxpayer for medical, dental, and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 2118. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct from gross income tuition paid by him to an institution of higher education for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 2119. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Kentucky among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 2120. A bill to authorize a per capita distribution of \$350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederate Tribes of the Colville Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 2121. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the higher education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2122. A bill to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employee organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 2123. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 2124. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 2125. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the operation of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2126. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency of the United States, to broaden the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 2127. A bill to designate the lake formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia, as "Lake Chat-tahoochee"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 2128. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the "Buy American Act," to require the construction, alteration, and repair of U.S. naval vessels in shipyards in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 2129. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2130. A bill to reunite families in the United States by granting nonquota status to certain aliens entitled to a preference under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2131. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work-measurement programs,

or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 2132. A bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 to increase the authorization for forest development roads and trails for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 2133. A bill to amend section 902(a) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of an additional \$100 to cover the cost of acquiring, opening and closing, and complete servicing of burial plot; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2134. A bill to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 2135. A bill to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize veterans with service-connected disabilities less than total who have \$5 per \$1,000 total disability income provisions included in their national service life insurance policies to obtain the \$10 per \$1,000 total disability income protection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2136. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2137. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 2138. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1958 to authorize reimbursement to Frankenmuth, Mich., for certain work on the flood control project on the Saginaw River, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 2139. A bill to permit the absence from duty for a minimum period of 2 hours of certain Federal employees for the purpose of voting in person in certain elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 2140. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the reemployment by the Government of disability annuitants who have recovered from their disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 2141. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 2142. A bill to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 2143. A bill to provide for the re-entitlement of certain surviving widows to annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act upon termination of their subsequent remarriages by reason of death of husband, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2144. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit charitable contributions, bequests, transfers, and gifts to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) to be deductible for income tax, estate tax, and gift tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 2145. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work-measurement programs, or other performance-standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2146. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2147. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to institute for the United States a civil action for preventive relief whenever any acts have been committed which would give rise to a cause of action under section 1980 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 2148. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the waiver of indebtedness to the United States arising out of a veteran's default in payment of a guaranteed home loan where the default occurred because of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2149. A bill to require that title to certain vessels supplied directly or indirectly by the United States for oceanographic research shall remain in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2150. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit, for 1 year the granting of national service life insurance to veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2151. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to permit employees to acquire an additional unit of insurance under such act by paying both the employee's and the Government's share of the cost of the premiums thereon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2152. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2153. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 2154. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to extend to employees retired on account of disability prior to October 1, 1956, the minimum annuity base established for those retired after that date; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2155. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2156. A bill to extend benefits under the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to the survivors of retired annuitants who died before April 1, 1948, and to employees who retired from the Tennessee Val-

ley Authority and Farm Credit Administration, prior to July 1, 1961; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to equalize additional annuities in return for contributions of annuitants during service in excess of the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity under such act at the time of their retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 2159. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission, to cooperate with the State of Alaska to study and report on the manner and extent to which the United States shall participate in the celebration in 1967 of the centennial anniversary of the purchase of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 2160. A bill to bring employees of agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to authorize length of service credit for periods of employment by agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, and to provide that annual leave unused at the end of a leave year shall be credited to the employee's sick leave account; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2161. A bill to provide certain employment preference for Government employees disabled in line of duty; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 2162. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2163. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local youth public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2164. A bill to amend the Library Service Act in order to make areas lacking public libraries or with inadequate public libraries, public elementary and secondary school libraries, and certain colleges and university libraries, eligible for benefits under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2165. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2166. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2167. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age

and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 2168. A bill to amend section 4161 of title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to provide for increasing the good-time allowances to be deducted from the terms of the sentences of prisoners convicted of offenses against the United States and confined in penal or correction institutions for a definite period other than for life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2169. A bill to amend section 1263 of title 18 of the United States Code to require that interstate shipments of intoxicating liquors be accompanied by bill of lading, or other documents, showing certain information in lieu of requiring such to be marked on the package; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2170. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antitrust Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes," and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 2171. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that payments under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act shall not be considered as income for the purposes of payment of pension under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 2172. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2173. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968), providing for the preparation of a membership roll of the Indians of the Yakima Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 125. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution amending the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 130. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the power of the States and their political subdivisions to tax the salaries and wages of persons who are not domiciliaries or residents thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.J. Res. 132. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate Philadelphia, Pa., as the site of a world's fair commemorating the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy test qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands at Fort Miles, Del., to the State of Delaware on terms no less favorable to Delaware than certain lands at the Fort Hancock Military Reservation, N.J., were recently conveyed to the State of New Jersey by the Secretary of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 141. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the permanent

representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.J. Res. 142. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week which includes July 4 as National Highway Safety Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President or for a candidate for election as a Senator or Representative in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.J. Res. 145. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 146. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval and reduction of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering the Congress to authorize the President to approve and disapprove separate items in any bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering the Congress to authorize the President to approve and disapprove separate items in bills with certain exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee for the purpose of awarding a Medal of Merit to citizens of the United States who have made significant contributions to the humanities and the arts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the offering of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H.J. Res. 151. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct a memorial to James Madison, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period of July 1 through July 7 as National Flag Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.J. Res. 154. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 155. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation

system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation should cooperate with other governmental authorities in the United States and with Canadian authorities to reduce oil pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to promoting international educational radio and television broadcasting as a means of achieving better understanding among and promoting education of the peoples of the world; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the operations of the United Nations being conducted in the Congo in violation of the United Nations Charter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. Res. 111. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. Res. 112. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Res. 113. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Res. 114. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. Res. 115. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Res. 116. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 117. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H. Res. 118. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. Res. 119. Resolution amending clause 2 (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALL:

H. Res. 120. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H. Res. 121. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 122. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of

rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. Res. 123. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. Res. 124. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McLOSKEY:

H. Res. 125. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H. Res. 126. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. Res. 127. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Res. 128. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Res. 129. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Res. 130. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SLACK:

H. Res. 131. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. Res. 132. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. Res. 133. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H. Res. 134. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 135. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 79; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. Res. 136. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to conduct an investigation and study of crimes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Res. 137. Resolution to create a committee for small unions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 138. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. Res. 139. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Res. 140. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the responsibilities of the Committee on

Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Res. 141. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of management and coordination problems in the various foreign assistance programs of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 142. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to conduct an investigation and study of the organization, management, operation, and administration of departments and agencies of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 143. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to aeronautical and other scientific research and development and outer space; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Res. 144. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of management and coordination problems in the various foreign assistance programs of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H. Res. 145. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 146. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Res. 147. Resolution to authorize identification cards for congressional staff members and committee members; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing strong support of Representative HUDDLESTON's bill designed to protect and promote the security of a vital segment of Alabama's economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to admit to citizenship Mrs. William Tiu and her children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2174. A bill for the relief of Nicola Nunnari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2175. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Barbetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2176. A bill for the relief of Sime Guzabat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2177. A bill for the relief of Andrea Castellano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2178. A bill for the relief of Won Loy Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 2179. A bill for the relief of Mrs. David Ishmael, Manhattan, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2180. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dini Wiradilaga Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2181. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Thomas E. Bell and Mary B. Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2182. A bill for the relief of Phillip L. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 2183. A bill for the relief of Helene Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 2184. A bill for the relief of Katka Milkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 2185. A bill for the relief of Jose Maldonado-Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 2186. A bill for the relief of George M. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2187. A bill for the relief of Michael and Concetta Terriaca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2188. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Theodosiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 2189. A bill for the relief of Morris Aronow and other employees of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2190. A bill for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2191. A bill for the relief of Jamil Hamady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 2192. A bill authorizing the readmittance of Walter Sowa, Jr., to the U.S. Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 2193. A bill for the relief of Tom Fook Tin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2194. A bill for the relief of Mariano Mundala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2195. A bill for the relief of Edward Wong (Woo Kok Wan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2196. A bill for the relief of Stephen Yu (Chun Pal Yu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2197. A bill for the relief of Miss Helena Hilda Butterfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2198. A bill for the relief of Joseph Tang-Nam, Yuck Har Tang-Nam, Willie Tang-Nam, Wilson (Richard) Tang-Nam, Willsang (Francis) Tang-Nam, Sue Young (Rose Marie) Tang-Nam, and Willmin (Bernard) Tang-Nam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 2199. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nestor Zenarosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 2200. A bill for the relief of Enrico Milano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 2201. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kazimierz Brzeski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 2202. A bill for the relief of Maurice Mo, Sam Wan Cheng Mo, and Sze Mai Mo (also known as Rosie S. Mo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2203. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Romeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2204. A bill for the relief of Luciano Lo Bello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2205. A bill for the relief of Elio Vecchiarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2206. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence J. Palombo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2207. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2208. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Scorsone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2209. A bill for the relief of Maria Petrozza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2210. A bill for the relief of Francesco Lupo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2211. A bill for the relief of Lucy P. T. Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2212. A bill for the relief of Domenico Palermi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2213. A bill for the relief of Dr. Giuseppe Spataro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2214. A bill for the relief of Raffaele and Franceschina Piscitelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 2215. A bill for the relief of E. A. Rolfe, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLAIMO:

H.R. 2216. A bill for the relief of Mario Calla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 2217. A bill for the relief of Basile and Palagia Stavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 2218. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isidro Enriquez Custodio and his wife, Elena Custodio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2219. A bill for the relief of Flora Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2220. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 2221. A bill to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 2222. A bill for the relief of Thurman & Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 2223. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Manuel Amaral Furtado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 2224. A bill for the relief of Bok Hi Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 2225. A bill for the relief of Fidel Villanueva Magbitang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2226. A bill for the relief of William Herbert vom Rath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2227. A bill for the relief of Marvin C. Norman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2228. A bill for the relief of the estate of Raffaello Busoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2229. A bill for the relief of Louis Adler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2230. A bill for the relief of Anna Trojnar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2231. A bill for the relief of Lillas Jane Reid McKnight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2232. A bill for the relief of Olimpia Barbano Clingo, Rosa Clingo, and Pietro Clingo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2233. A bill for the relief of Sau Hung Wong and Wai Kin Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2234. A bill for the relief of Barbara Mlynarczykowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2235. A bill for the relief of Monique M. Gibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2236. A bill for the relief of Maria del Rosario de Fatima Lopez Hayes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 2237. A bill for the relief of Maria Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2238. A bill for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 2239. A bill for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2240. A bill for the relief of Angela Teresa Petrelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2241. A bill for the relief of Ephra Eulini Christian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 2242. A bill for the relief of Guzin Delman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 2243. A bill for the relief of Ana Santos Nogueira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 2244. A bill for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2245. A bill for the relief of Stella McKee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2246. A bill for the relief of Soterios Bafaktaris and his wife, Efthemia Bafaktaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2247. A bill for the relief of Estefania Racheva de Mussevits (nee Stefana Domushtcheva); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 2248. A bill for the relief of Miss Mary R. Verso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2249. A bill for the relief of Miss Varsen Emciyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2250. A bill for the relief of Lucio Marinucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2251. A bill for the relief of Juana Brandariz Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2252. A bill for the relief of the family of Capt. William B. Clifford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2253. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sayed Ahmad Madani and Shami H. Madani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2254. A bill for the relief of Emilia D'Addario Santorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2255. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marianna Martino Paviglianiti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2256. A bill for the relief of Jose Domenech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2257. A bill for the relief of Kenneth F. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2258. A bill for the relief of Loreto Mario Vincenzo Angeloni, Emilia Nella Angeloni, and Enzo Angeloni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2259. A bill for the relief of Beatriz Foronda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rozsi Neuman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2261. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kyu Soo Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 2262. A bill for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 2263. A bill for the relief of Eve Banasiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2264. A bill for the relief of Tak Wa Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 2265. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rasheedi Kater; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 2266. A bill for the relief of A. A. Lindley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2267. A bill for the relief of G. J. Guitreau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2269. A bill for the relief of Lucy Malca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 2270. A bill for the relief of Maglorina Magnante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2271. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catalina Castillo Cantos Savell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2272. A bill for the relief of Filipinas J. Lowery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2273. A bill for the relief of Edward George Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2274. A bill for the relief of Donald Heywood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2275. A bill for the relief of Vilma Angela Roberts, nee Keller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 2276. A bill for the relief of Kyriakoula Michalopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2277. A bill for the relief of Colombo Melone, his wife, Vivalda Melone, and his minor child, Maria Teresa Melone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Czeslaw Michalewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2279. A bill for the relief of Philip C. Konstantelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2280. A bill for the relief of George Hatzopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2281. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Vlasios Manaves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2282. A bill for the relief of Jozefa Pletka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Rosario Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 2284. A bill to authorize the disposal of surplus equipment, materials, books, and supplies under section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to the Arizona Boys' Ranch and Epil-Hab Phoenix, Inc.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 2285. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bedros Manguikian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2286. A bill for the relief of Peter Gerhard Kubetschek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2287. A bill for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Ingrid Henriette Bela Wolff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Marie Tchernosvitoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Marija Lullie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 2291. A bill regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2292. A bill for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2293. A bill to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2294. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 2295. A bill for the relief of Mui Kim Chen Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 2296. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evdokia Giorgiaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2297. A bill for the relief of Hisoe Iwata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2298. A bill for the relief of Byung Yong Cho (Alan Cho Gardner) and Moonee Choi (Charlie Gardner); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2299. A bill for the relief of Harry N. Duff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2300. A bill for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 2301. A bill for the relief of Georgios (George) Theoharis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 2302. A bill for the relief of James M. Norman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 2303. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Kolliou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2304. A bill for the relief of Henry Gamero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2305. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Friedmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2306. A bill for the relief of Uichi Kayahara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2307. A bill for the relief of Lillian E. Gonzales (Reyes); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2308. A bill for the relief of William Bloom (also known as William Blake); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2309. A bill for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 2310. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Verveniotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2311. A bill for the relief of Eugenia K. Verros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2312. A bill for the relief of Spyros Athanasopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 2313. A bill for the relief of Izhak Sokolski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2314. A bill conferring U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Jeno Balazs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBEL:

H.R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Akabi Ozdere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 2316. A bill for the relief of Edward Kuen Sang Shum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 2317. A bill for the relief of Janos Kardos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2318. A bill for the relief of Antonio da Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 2319. A bill for the relief of Maj. Lionel L. Riave, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 2320. A bill for the relief of Frederick Ho Wolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2321. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Faye E. Russell Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 2322. A bill for the relief of Frances Kastelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2323. A bill for the relief of Teresa Mikucki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2324. A bill for the relief of Rosa Stefano Ratajczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 2325. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mari Ipeklogullari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 2326. A bill for the relief of Maurice Casner and Eileen G. Casner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 2327. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

17. By Mr. COHELAN: Petition of San Francisco East Bay Community Forum For Civil Liberties to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

18. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Margaret C. Vosbury, president, Twentieth Century Club, Washington, D.C., relative to urging the Federal Government to pay a higher proportion of expenses in maintaining the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

President Kennedy's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this was my first experience as a new Member of Congress to hear the President deliver in person his state of the Union message to the Congress and the people of the United States. It was not only a most exhilarating but also a most sobering experience.

I could not help but think, as I sat and listened to our Chief Executive, that here was a man who is very serious minded, who has deep understanding of our Nation's problems, and who possesses the leadership and the ability to cope with these problems in this very crucial period in world history.

The program he presented to Congress today is a sensible one. I am in agreement with most of the proposals con-

tained in that program, because they are in the best interests of the American people. I am very much encouraged by the President's assurance that "we have every reason to believe that our tide's running strong."

I believe the President deserves the full support of the people. I shall do all I can to help in the enactment of his program.

Judge Patrick T. Stone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 13, 1963, death brought an end to the career of one of our Nation's most eminent and able jurists. Patrick T. Stone succumbed to cancer at his home in Wausau, Wis. He was 73 years old. For 30 years he had served the people of Wisconsin as judge

of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin.

He served the people well. For him, the speedy and impartial administration of justice was not just an ideal to which our judicial system should aspire—it was the basic and necessary principle of his daily courtroom conduct.

Despite a schedule that would have staggered the most ambitious of men, Judge Stone was always up to date in his work. His court was a model of efficiency, impartiality and dignity.

At the same time, his deep compassion for people was well known and greatly appreciated by all who had the privilege of working with him.

Judge Stone was born in Ontario, Canada, but moved with his family to Tomahawk, Wis., when he was 2. He attended Tomahawk's public schools and received his law degree from Marquette University Law School. During World War I, Judge Stone served in the U.S. Navy. After practicing law and serving as Wausau city attorney for 8 years, Judge Stone was appointed to the Federal bench in 1933 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. His was the first judicial appointment made by the new President.